

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

October, 1941

SOME FRUITS OF SILENCE	<i>William Wistar Comfort</i> 281
NOTES ON THE PROBLEM OF SUFFERING	<i>Julius Seelye Bixler</i> 288
SELF-PITY IN THE PSALMS	<i>Ovid R. Sellers</i> 297
ONE HOLY CHURCH	<i>Edwin L. Clarke</i> 301
A FRESH VIEW OF THE INTRODUCTION TO PAUL'S LETTERS	<i>Donald W. Riddle</i> 306
KEACH—WHITEFIELD—RIPPON: A BYPATH IN EARLY HYMNODY	<i>W. T. Whitley</i> 315
THE CALL OF THE PROPHET AMOS	<i>Rolland Emerson Wolfe</i> 323
PROFESSOR BRIGHTMAN'S "CHRISTIAN ESSENTIALS"	<i>M. C. Otto</i> 329
FROM OFF THE CAMPUS AND ON	337
BOOK REVIEWS	339
BOOK NOTICES	348
BOOKS RECEIVED	352
ANNUAL INDEX	353

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Published by
Crozer Theological Seminary
Chester, Pennsylvania

MORTON S. ENSLIN, Editor
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, Business Manager

The policy of the CROZER QUARTERLY is to present investigations, discussions, and reviews in the field of religion which will prove of value and interest to the professional student of religion and to the layman.

Manuscripts, books for review, and communications for the editor
should be addressed

Editor of the CROZER QUARTERLY
Chester, Pennsylvania

Business communications and subscriptions should be addressed
Business Manager of the CROZER QUARTERLY
Chester, Pennsylvania

Issued Quarterly \$1.50 a year Single Numbers, 40 cents

Printed for the Crozer Theological Seminary by
THE JUDSON PRESS
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Copyright, October, 1941, by Crozer Theological Seminary.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Vol. XVIII

OCTOBER, 1941

No. 4

SOME FRUITS OF SILENCE¹

WILLIAM WISTAR COMFORT

Haverford College

IT WAS on April 20, that beautiful peaceful Sunday, that my mind was first occupied with thoughts of the occasion which we have met this morning to celebrate. Outside the open window were banks of forsythia and beds of daffodils, like two visible mines of golden treasure. The first wrens were busily house hunting and peered up at me from the very window sill—the same family has done so for many years. A pair of dapper peewees were already installed under the eaves. A flicker was rapping on some dead wood. A song sparrow was singing nearby, oblivious of a cardinal who was insistently calling to mass at his lofty altar. The first bumblebees and wasps were buzzing about the cornices looking for a place to establish their adobe houses. All these creatures were busy and happy and in their right place. And yet, there are people who have no sense of usefulness and contentment, and can see no purpose for which they were created—confirmed victims of a frivolous overstimulated existence, of whose futility they are vaguely conscious.

In many parts of the world man has taken affairs into his own hands, with poor success. Truth is on the scaffold, while deceit, cruelty, suspicion, and especially fear are in control. The heathen are raging, and even Christians after two thousand years of knowing better are imagining vain solutions for their troubles. Our own people, whether nominally Christian or essentially pagan, are preparing to join in the general rout and retreat toward prepared positions of defense based on moral principles which were worn out and proved inadequate centuries ago. The deplorable effect of times like these is that we are all dragged down to a lower moral level. Despite all the talk about a new social order, and innumerable plans for the defense of liberty, democracy, and the rights of man, we all ought to know that if these ideals are secured at all, it will not be by the employment of means unsuited by their very nature to produce peace, justice, good will, and the good life for which we yearn. Those of us who survived the vicissitudes of the last international strife ought not to be so naïve as to cherish any illusions regarding the fate of our national moral assets if we become involved in this bigger and better conflict.

¹ Commencement address, Crozer Theological Seminary, June 3, 1941.

I have no intention, however, of dwelling today upon the modern equivalent of the terror by night and the arrow that flieth by day, nor upon the pestilence that walketh in darkness and the destruction that wasteth at noonday. I have no inside information, as so many of our newspaper writers and radio commentators affect to have, regarding the titanic struggle which is being waged. It must be, however, in the background of our thoughts as we gird ourselves to face a situation which cannot be disregarded. It is for men of such professions as yours and mine to seek to maintain ourselves on an even keel, in order that we may keep very near in these days ahead to the source of all truth, and help others to do so. If we have any function in the present turmoil and rushing tides of human passions, it is to remain firmly attached to the rock which is immovable, to lift up our eyes to the hills whence comes our strength. Men of old were summoned to do this before there appeared any Christ among men to serve as a living example; men today still can and do find a sure way leading to truth and life in the example of this elder Brother who was tempted in all points even as we are, and who was yet without sin.

With the thought of this pure and sinless figure at the centre of our religious profession, there are many Christians who exclaim today, "How can our God who is all-powerful and all-merciful tolerate such conditions as prevail in the world? Can he be sleeping, or has he, like Baal, gone on a journey?" Well, we may as well stop asking such futile questions, and cease imploring him to stop the strife. It is not his war. It has pleased him to allow man to make his own choices, and if he chooses evil, to take the consequences. Our troubles will cease not by futile prayer and oblations to an irate or thoughtless God, but by a return ourselves individually to communion with his spirit and to the deliberate intention to do always those things that are righteous and pleasing in his sight through Jesus Christ our Lord. That is the first and most difficult lesson which Christians have to learn today. The alibi that it is all God's doing is an insult to him and is pitifully childish on our part. But it is much easier to go on blaming another party for the woes of man than to meet the issue ourselves and prepare to coöperate ourselves with what we believe to be the divine plan. If as professional men in our comparatively untrammelled and favored walk of life, we can keep above the conflict—*au-dessus de la mêlée*—as Romain Rolland called it, we may render a greater service to our fellow men than by joining in the hue and cry of the swashbucklers or with the pious group who sit and cry, "How long, O Lord, how long?"

It is fair to assume that a spiritually minded group of people like these present here this morning would unite in the belief that man has

forsaken his partnership with God and has decided to go it alone; that until there is a radical change of heart, with an appropriate admission of guilt and a renunciation of self—both personal and national—there will be no permanent change for the better. The changes that must come in the national and international set-up will doubtless express themselves in economic terms, but the economists will have no success until there is a change of heart, until, like the prodigal, people are convinced of error and see a better way. Let us not fool ourselves on this point. Any other expectation is to expect to gather grapes from thorns or figs of thistles. There is reason to believe, however, that there is a growing number of people in our country who are beginning to understand what is the matter with humanity and who entertain no longer any illusions about might making right or about the attainment of desired ends by immoral means.

Such people do not get much encouragement from the press and radio propagandists who are all working on a double shift these days. But why should we expect to receive spiritual instruction from such sources? For spiritual instruction we must turn inward and meet face to face him who said God is a spirit and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth. There are really very few people who do this, but anyone may do it, and if he does, he is likely to get some pretty direct help regarding his personal duty.

Different people worship God in different ways. It will never be otherwise, nor need we waste time in wishing it to be otherwise. Some worship in crowds and some as individuals, some to the accompaniment of organs and timbrels, others in silence; some vicariously through an elaborate ritual of man's device, and some individually through an active emotional participation. It is not for us to judge of the effectiveness of these different modes of worship. But there is a minimum of effect upon which we may insist: first, the spirit of man must have a first-hand experience of the presence of God; and second, there must be a visible carry-over of this experience into our daily lives: Men must see that we have walked with God and reflect his image.

If we are to trust to divine authority and the highest human experiences, the place to meet God is in our hearts, because that is where he is. Any procedure which calls us off from reliance upon merely human interruptions and leaves us face to face with the Holy Spirit in our own hearts is to be welcomed. "Who would talk when God works?" And he does work; he works on us, if our instrument of audition is in tune with the instrumentality which he uses. "Hereby know we that we are in him and he in us, because he has given us of his spirit." The instruments are made by the same Maker; they are so fitted that

we may keep in tune with his witness in our hearts. We may use the word *witness* or *spirit* or *inward light*, but we mean the same thing. We mean, however, something more than a conscience. Conscience is often a social product and hence subject to change. Good Christians have witnessed a great change in their conscience regarding human slavery, for example; what they once thought was right is now seen to be wrong. Certain social injustices which once troubled no conscience are now regarded as wrong. But truth in the inward parts, the voice of a *God-illuminated* conscience, would never have sanctioned these wrongs. That they have been at last recognized for what they are is due only to the faithfulness of some few Christians who heard the divine voice, who saw the inward light in their own hearts and who acted in accordance with its dictates. As we say colloquially, "Their conscience was tendered," and society has benefited by their faithfulness. So, and so only, must it be with war, the greatest curse of humanity with which we have still to deal.

No, the inward light, the witness, the Word which was in the beginning, is something more than conscience. By the widest stretch we can only say that it is a *God-illuminated* conscience. It is "that of God in every man," that light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world, according to his use of which, man shall be judged in this life before attaining any other that follows it in another realm of pure spirit. It is the one sure compass according to which we can steer our course in life with the inward assurance that we are acting in conformity to the divine will. One final little illustration: Near my house is an important crossroads where many accidents have occurred. There is a traffic light showing, when it is working, red, yellow, and green. It works as a stop and go light at a certain place and at specific times. That is conscience. It permits me to pass on or it tells me to stop. It does *not* tell me if I am on the right road. Fortunately there is a permanent signpost, legible at all hours of the day or night for him who will stop and read it. Turn one way to Bryn Mawr, turn the other way for Philadelphia, go straight ahead for Newtown Square. I know that I am at the corner of Haverford Road and College Avenue. I know where I am and affirmatively where to go. That is inward light, the divine will asserted for our benefit.

How can we make use of this light in our daily lives? Evidently our whole effectiveness depends upon our coöperation with this will of God concerning us. Your work as leaders and reconcilers of men depends upon your discovery and constant use of this precious guidepost set up in your own hearts, before you can help others. It can only be consulted in quiet. As a still small voice, it can only be heard in silence.

Seek therefore for silence, and teach your people to do so. Silence is far more impressive than noise, stillness is more eloquent than words. One of the few important legacies of the Romantic movement was its emphasis upon the majestic silence of nature and upon our communion with it. Only after the flourishing of literary romanticism did men seek the mountains and lakes and woods for strength and inspiration. No one in the seventeenth century would have sung of rocks and rills, or woods and templed hills. But now nearly everyone longs for silence, escape from people, and if they have the ability to do so, they build "a lodge in some vast wilderness, some boundless contiguity of shade," where they can spend the summer and recruit their energies for the struggle with men and things. Even if they be inarticulate, many feel that the company of God is so much more satisfying than that of men. "God made the country, and man made the town" was never so willingly admitted as it is today.

How can we find silence in our daily lives? It is indeed hard to find in the market place, the stock exchange, the department stores, the means of transportation, the football games, the lecture halls, and even in the churches and in our homes. Someone is constantly dinning in our ears something we ought to know or think or do. We spend our days in exchanging information of which we make no use after we get it. One of the strangest features of our American civilization is our thirst for facts, for information please, and our incompetence to do any thinking for ourselves or to engage in effective concentration—that is, concentration which carries our intelligence out into new territory and establishes outposts to mark our gain. Yet there is only one greater satisfaction than to gain some new territory for ourselves in the intellectual domain, and that is to gain new territory in the spiritual domain. It is absolutely necessary that we should take time in silence to consolidate our gains and assimilate them by a process of silent consecration.

But having proved that we are not mere machines by making time for silence, how can I concentrate, how can I surrender myself entirely to divine guidance? There are helps: a prayer book, a hymn, a book of selected religious readings, an *Introduction to the Devout Life*, the *Imitation of Christ*, or best of all our Bible itself, from which all the others are derived. This meditation must be spiritual, not intellectual, in its search. All striving should cease, and guidance should be sought and expected. I do not need to tell you what may come out of such moments of waiting. But it may be well to encourage you to multiply them, for there will come times when you will need them. Not only at the great crossroads of life, but in the give and take of our daily contacts in society and business do we need to keep cool and calm. This can

be done only by switching on the inner light and tackling the situation under its guidance. This clear consciousness of Christ within, the hope of glory, being actually associated with us as a partner in well-doing is a marvelous source of peace and of strength. We do not need to worry about the impression we are making, or the success of our projects. If we cannot ask the blessing of divine favor and coöperation, the cause will fail, but "I can do all things through him who strengtheneth me." The moral and spiritual resources of the universe are ours, and they are far more irresistible than most of us will admit.

If, as I am sure, many of you are fully persuaded by your own experience of the truth of what I have been saying, it is strange that we provide for only intermittent use of these mighty currents, these tides which can sweep into the human heart and make us pure. When you have done your best in your sermons, when you have received an attentive hearing, will you not teach your people to sit in silence with bowed heads in order that they may continue and apply your thought within themselves? Instead of launching them at once upon the 153rd hymn omitting the third and fourth verses, explain to them that the most important part of the service has been reached and now you hand them over to One who is more competent and loving than yourself. Such silence may, indeed, be golden.

It is true that many congregations who are used to worshipping only vicariously and, as it were, through the ministrations of another, will feel lonely and inadequate at first when left to themselves. They may be reminded that you are not leaving them to themselves, but to the best of companions, the Way, the Truth, and the Life—one who speaks as never man spake. It is particularly true in spiritual matters that a man is likely to value most what he discovers for himself, what he *feels* within, rather than what he hears, what he is told by another. So many souls are really lonely. You will be conferring a great blessing if you can render them more familiar with One within who can speak to their condition and who never disappoints him who diligently seeks his company.

But once a week in church, or once a day in the study, is not enough. If we thus limit ourselves, we cheat ourselves. This witness, this inner light, is available at all times even on the crowded street corner, even in the heat of battle. A split second suffices to establish contact, to hear the voice of the Good Companion. For he walks with us and he talks with us. As quickly as by the flip of a radio dial, one can put oneself in tune. And then, who wants to lie, to deceive, to slander, to bear false witness, to plan some unethical deal, to entertain unclean thoughts, or to wrong another? We are vaccinated, rendered immune; the devil's wiles are foiled and his weapon falls harmlessly. "A thousand

shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand, but it shall not come nigh thee. Only with thine eyes shalt thou behold and see the reward of the wicked." That was said a long while ago, and we are pleading today for nothing new. Rather for the realization that we may live even today in the presence of God, that we may practice this continual presence. He will not leave us comfortless, he will come to us. For the Christian life must still be conceived of as a fight, a struggle between the forces of good and of evil in our individual hearts. Many ways of saying this have been used by godly men. But what we want is the complete armor of God, and when we have got it, let us put it on and stand. That is the kind of men the world needs—men who think upon whatsoever things are true, honest, just, pure, lovely, and of good report. Perhaps if we thought more upon these things and shouted less about freedom and democracy, we should actually be more free and democratic. The congregations want more men in the pulpit who know what they believe, who know where the only true strength is, and who modestly and tactfully, but convincingly, witness to it in their daily lives. The congregations are like the Indian chief who told John Woolman, "I like to feel where words come from."

It is so easy in America today to go along with the crowd, to be yes-men, to say, "I guess there is not much harm in social drinking, in church lotteries, in bridge stakes, in petting, in taking our share of the cut in a crooked deal. Everybody is doing it." But we are crying in the ranks for less shilly-shallying, less carrying of water on both shoulders, fewer spineless men who are afraid to say "No!" So many persons are priding themselves on their liberality, their willingness to compromise. All of our recent shifts in values have tended to lower our moral standards. We have got clean away from respect for Victorian decency, and still farther away from those delicate points of conscience for which our ancestors in the seventeenth century surrendered their freedom or even their lives. It requires some assurance to claim that we can be counted today among those nations which are blessed because their God is the Lord. It has become so easy to qualify as a Christian that only a few know what it is to take that yoke which our ancestors delighted to bear. In the presence of easy divorce, an unclean press, gross intemperance, covert gambling, and political corruption, which are sucking at the vitals of our civilization, where are the men who with that perfect love that casteth out fear appeal only to "that of God in every man"—leaders who know the combination which can unlock the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High? Such are those who having found the divine presence in secret and in silence shall be rewarded openly.

NOTES ON THE PROBLEM OF SUFFERING

JULIUS SEELYE BIXLER

Harvard Divinity School

A FEW years ago it would not have been unfair to say that "Man the Thinker," chin on hand with wrinkled brow, occupied an honorable if somewhat aloof position above the common walks of life. Today, however, he has stepped down from his pedestal. In popular estimation he is identified with "Man the Talker," and talk, through its association with propaganda and persuasive but unreliable advertising, is considered of doubtful value. Even in philosophical circles it is widely believed that speech has been led astray by its own subtlety and has betrayed the cause of truth. With the rise first of pragmatism and then of logical positivism philosophy has shifted its interest to "Man the Doer" in the sense either of worker for results or manipulator of experimental apparatus and physical stuff. At the same time theology, caught in the throes of a similar revolt against abstract thought, calls for a more vigorous weapon with which to battle against the forces of unbelief. Today it makes a special effort to fix our attention on "Man the Sinner" and to find in the idea of sin the surest clue to our relation with the divine.

This paper would ask whether "Man the Seer," in the sense of possessor of insights, is not a more appropriate object of study, and would suggest that at a time when mental and physical suffering is so sharply on the increase we should try once again to discover the significance for religion of the experiences of "Man the Sufferer." Granting the obvious truth that men suffer on account of sin, their own and the sins of others, and that in terms of practice nothing is more important than the overcoming of sin, it is still a question whether for theological theory the fact of suffering is not more important.

We notice in the first place that suffering reaches further than sin. All men suffer, some of them most of the time. Comparatively few men sin in any grievous or significant sense, unless the word be made co-terminous with the human situation itself.¹ To make it so broad, however, is to deprive it of meaning. Sin should be defined as selfishness. It is a mistake to claim, with some contemporary writers, that it always follows human freedom. As a matter of fact where true freedom exists it is progressively eliminated. Of suffering the same cannot be said, for its inevitability is a patent fact of experience. Again, the idea of sin is treated in detail by only one of the historical religions, whereas the idea

¹ As it is, for example, following Augustine and Luther, by Reinhold Niebuhr in his recently published Gifford Lectures.

of suffering is central in several. And of the relation between sin and suffering in Christianity itself Charles Péguy has said

The Son has taken upon himself all the sins of the world
And the mother all the grief.²

The suffering of the mother is the more inclusive since she endures pain both at her son's birth and at his death. Suffering seems to span the arc of life and to overreach even the experience of sin and its redemption. This all-enfolding quality symbolized in the eternally sorrowing feminine helps the student of religions to understand the worship of the Great Mother in Asia Minor or the compassionate Kwan-yin in China as well as that of the Virgin Mary. Even when suffering is associated with a man, the emphasis is still on the feeling of universality and of common participation in pain which emerges from the sorrowing experience of the great soul,—witness the example of Gautama in India or the growing semi-religious cult of Lincoln in our own country.

In the second place, it is doubtful whether on the practical side it is well to talk so much of sin and its inevitability. To make sin inevitable by calling it original or inherited is to allow our theological sophistication to blur the outlines of our moral vision. The word *sin* takes on theological connotations which keep it among the major interests of a certain type of religious mind and prevent it from having any effect on those who consider themselves emancipated from religion. Thus it creates in the righteous an unhealthy remorse for imagined errors while the actual sinners are confirmed in their indifference and immunity.

Suffering, however, refuses either to be pigeonholed and forgotten or to have its rough edges made smooth by any sophisticated treatment. So far as theology is concerned, suffering presents a problem chiefly because it defies all efforts at inclusion in a well-articulated theory of man and his relation to the universe. As one studies the history of theology, one is surprised that moral evil, although the blacker and seemingly more irreconcilable of the two, is yet more easily placed in a theological theory than is physical evil. Moral evil is not hard to account for since it is only natural that men should follow their own desires in indifference to others. Nor is it so difficult to get rid of it theologically and to show that it does not interfere with the final harmony. The Divine will which has been flouted can emerge triumphant, and the human individual by repenting of his sin can take up once more the broken threads of his own life.

But the idea of suffering leaves the circle uncompleted, the harmonic progression unresolved. No restoration to freedom can really atone for

² These lines of Charles Péguy were called to my attention by Mr. Paul Kuntz.

the horrors of the concentration camp. No heavenly bliss can balance the account of the soldier whose death deprives him of his normal expectation as a man. Jacob Riis used to say that anyone who could comprehend the misery of the slums would never smile again, implying that we keep our sanity only by deliberately shutting ourselves off from an understanding of the way millions of men actually live. Suffering, in other words, is the stark, unmitigated fact, where sin has become, for theology, the sophisticated idea. Suffering reveals a cosmos with frayed edges and unrelieved patches of darkness. It is a symbol of incompleteness and instability. Dostoevsky makes Ivan put the issue as follows:

Listen! If all must suffer to pay for the eternal harmony, what have children to do with it, tell me, please? . . . I understand solidarity among men. I understand solidarity in retribution, too; but there can be no such solidarity with children. And if it is really true that they must share responsibility for all their fathers' crimes, such a truth is not of this world and is beyond my comprehension. . . . If the sufferings of children go to swell the sum of sufferings which was necessary to pay for truth, then I protest that the truth is not worth such a price And so I hasten to give back my entrance ticket, and if I am an honest man I am bound to give it back as soon as possible. And that I am doing. It's not God that I don't accept, Alyosha, only I most respectfully return Him the ticket.³

What do we mean when we say that the idea of suffering is a symbol of incompleteness and instability? First of all, that it leads to contradictory procedures and unresolved dilemmas. Suffering makes religion necessary and seems also to make it impossible. Because of suffering we seek religion. "Evil," says Canon Streeter (and he means physical evil), "presents a problem so urgent that according to the profundity of the solution which it offers, every religion and every philosophy must finally be judged."⁴ It forces us, that is, to seek a religious explanation. Yet it also prevents us from accepting such an explanation because religion points toward a good God who must himself shudder at the suffering his children have to endure. Thus it stimulates us to build a theory which it tears down as soon as built. The religious man is in a quandary since his religion which makes him more alert to values also sharpens his sense for disvalues. The same motives which prompt him to love a world which contains such beauty make him hate it for its ugliness. Unamuno can say, "Suffering is the substance of life and root of personality," and we think we understand him. Yet we should prefer a life of which these things could not be said. Suffering makes life good; it also makes it intolerable.

Let us notice in the second place that the word *suffering* reveals an instability in its own denotation. Observe how difficult it is to retain

³ F. Dostoevsky, *The Brothers Karamazov* (Modern Library Ed.) p. 300.

⁴ B. H. Streeter, *Reality*, p. 58.

the specific reference to experienced pain as we treat it theologically. We believe, for example, that suffering in itself is always bad. It meets none of our tests for value since it is neither an object of desire nor a rationally judged good. Unless he is a psychopath, no one seeks it either for himself or for others.

Yet we say that a world without suffering would be bad or at most morally neutral. What we mean is that a world without the possibility of suffering would be bad. But is this the same thing? Are we thinking of the actual agonized terror of the child in the presence of the screaming, blasting bomb? It is at least a question whether a world with such real events is good at all. It is even a question whether a world with the abstract possibility of this child's suffering is good. Only when the experience has lost its particularity in the general idea that suffering as such is needful for moral victory does it become good, and the question is whether it is still suffering of which we speak. Like the word *experience*, *suffering* is a weasel word or perhaps a chameleon word that changes color while we look at it.

It is the possibility of suffering, then, that is good, or at most suffering-in-general. And even suffering-in-general is not itself good but is good merely in the sense that it enters into relationships which, as we at least try to believe, transform it. Only as we talk of conditions-in-general and attempt to frame a *Weltanschauung* or total picture does the idea of suffering fit into place. Yet the instability confronts us at this point as well. If we try to find the outlines of a total picture, it is because of a desire to discover the *rationale* of our experience. But rationality means fitness, and it is hard to fit suffering into the same world picture which includes reasonable human hopes and ambitions. The real problem of suffering comes not because it denies us what we actually and sometimes cheaply want, but because it cuts across our critically judged wants and blocks the reasonable good. The sensitive and disciplined mind cannot live at peace or with a sense of religious triumph in a world like ours—this is what leaves the picture unfinished. Amphitryon's cry to Zeus, "Thou art a stupid god, or not an honest one,"⁶ or Jeremiah's "Wilt thou be altogether unto me as a liar?"⁷ must have sprung to the lips of many an agonized believer. Because of suffering the world may indeed be a vale for soul-making, but is the end worth the price, especially when some souls are made at the expense of others? Wouldn't a little less suffering have done just as well? Or is the problem as acute in the case of James's lonely tortured individual who endures that others may be happy?

⁶ Euripides, *Herakles Mad*, 347.

⁷ Jer. 15: 18.

This leads us to ask whether we should not take suffering as a datum which, as is the habit of data, undergoes a change when it becomes an idea. What is it that actually happens when a great religious thinker reflects on suffering and builds his theology on it? There are at least three answers to this question. Such reflection may lead 1. to the view that pain infects the world as a whole and in its ubiquity helps to reveal the world's solidarity. The conclusion will then be predominantly pessimistic or optimistic as the pain or the solidarity is emphasized. Or 2. it may lead to the view that no idea of wholeness is possible and that pluralism reigns. Or 3. it may lead to practical effort to overcome private grief in devotion to common good. Suffering may in this way reveal the significance of community experience.

As instances of the first type, where the idea of suffering colors the total picture, let us take Buddha and Hosea. When Buddha was overcome by seeing the old man, the sick man, and the funeral, his problem came from his insight into the universal fact of evil represented by the particular experiences. If life is characterized in its essence by sickness, old age, and approaching death, and if the universe in its essence is such as to produce life of that kind, then life and that which nourishes it are both bad. As is well known, Buddha did not abide by the consequences of his own analysis, but allowed sympathy to override argument. With little logic, but with great compassion, he spent his life trying to redeem a world seemingly hopeless from the start and worked out a practical philosophy of moral effort set against a background of metaphysical pessimism. Our most searching insight into the universal reveals evil, he said. The world in its universal quality is infected with pain. But practically we should ignore the ultimacy of evil that we may conquer it as individuals, here and now.

Hosea also sought the universal revealed in suffering, but reached a more optimistic conclusion since he discovered that through the universal experience of suffering men become sharers in the life of God. Hosea said to his people: I speak to you not on a particularistic basis as prince or priest or prophet or even as Jew, but out of the experience of a husband and father, or in other words, as loving and suffering man. In the intimacies of private life I discover the universal in which all men participate by virtue of the fact that they are men. Suffering is the law of life which applies to all men and even to God. In its universality it reveals the nature of the cosmos itself and shows that we must think of the cosmic spirit as suffering with us.

To illustrate the second type, where recourse is had to pluralism, let us take examples from the letters of Father Tyrrell and Baron von Hügel. The former once wrote to a dying friend:

I have long since ceased trying to explain the confusions and catastrophes of life in any coherent way. What I cling to still is the belief that most lives are justified by one or a very few moments that bring out the best in us. The rest is mere padding and sawdust. If that is not true, I do not know what to think, for utilitarian standards are mere moonshine. A few hours of endeavor and endurance on the rack of the cross have an absolute value that will last when all our works are obliterated like scratchings on the sand.⁷

Baron von Hügel wrote to his niece: "Religion has never made me happy; it's no use shutting your eyes to the fact that the deeper you go, the more alone you will find yourself."⁸

In both cases the effort at harmonious inclusiveness of all ideas in one completely consistent whole is given up, and resort is had to faith as a means of meeting a situation acknowledged to be incomplete. The incompleteness is on the side of theory, it should be observed. In practice both these men met life and its problems with a unity of purpose which others might well envy. Yet both seem to have been haunted by the suggestion of lack of finality in the relation between religious belief and the data it tries to explain.

The writers of our third group are more articulate in showing how private pain is transmuted into common love. For example, Katherine Mansfield says in her *Journal*:

I do not want to die without leaving a record of my belief that suffering can be overcome . . . Do not resist. Take it. Be overwhelmed. Accept it fully. Make it *part of life*. Everything that we really accept undergoes a change. So suffering must become love. This is the mystery. This is what I must do. I must pass from personal love to greater love.⁹

In the same strain Kierkegaard writes:

One must have suffered very much in the world and have been very uncomfortable before there can even be any talk of loving one's neighbor. It is only by dying to the joys and happiness of the world in self-denial that the neighbor comes into existence . . . No one who clings to earthly life loves his neighbor, that is to say, his neighbor does not exist for him.¹⁰

Similarly Unamuno: "Men love one another with a spiritual love only when they have suffered the same sorrow together."¹¹ After the death of his infant son William James wrote in a letter: "It brings one closer to all mankind—this world old experience."¹²

⁷ M. D. Petre, *Autobiography and Life of George Tyrrell*, Vol. 2, pp. 427-8.

⁸ G. Greene, *Letters from Baron Friedrich von Hügel to a Niece*, p. xvi.

⁹ *Journal of Katherine Mansfield*, p. 166. Quoted by E. W. Lyman, *The Meaning and Truth of Religion*, p. 412.

¹⁰ S. Kierkegaard, *Journal*, p. 696.

¹¹ M. Unamuno, *The Tragic Sense of Life*, p. 135.

¹² The entire letter is quoted in my *Religion in the Philosophy of William James*, p. 160.

What we learn from these quotations is that suffering can be made into an instrument whereby selfish privacy is transformed into devotion to common good. We observe that so far as theory is concerned, the situation is still incomplete. No happy ending is assured and no final harmony, either intellectual or emotional, is promised. Metaphysically the fact of suffering points to a tension and conflict in the nature of the universe itself. God, it would seem, must be both the Idea of the Good and the *Demiourgos*. God is absolute as is the Idea of the Good with a goodness that always hovers above our efforts to match it, but he is limited in the sense that his will cannot be completely effective in a world which contains both natural law and human freedom. But for practical life this means that instead of waiting for a complete answer to our problems before we begin to act we should emphasize to ourselves the indubitable fact that some suffering can be transmuted through love. If we are to live successfully in a universe which contains suffering, we should notice what love does and pay less attention to the theoretical question of what it would like to do. And we may well bear in mind that to transform private grief into devotion to the common good means that we act not merely as individuals but, so far as we can see, as a part of the creative process itself. For love, like democracy, is less the assumption that a complete harmony exists or is ever attainable than it is the active effort to impose harmony on recalcitrant material. Like reason, also, it is a working force which progressively brings order out of chaos. Neither in human life or the life of the divine can static perfection exist. Our Father worketh hitherto and we work. Love, then, is reason and truth in action. Bertrand Russell brings this out when he says: "The impartiality which, in contemplation, is the unalloyed desire for truth is the very same quality of mind which in action is justice and in emotion is that universal love which can be given to all."¹³

The problem of evil, arising from the fact of suffering in a world controlled by a good God, has been met in three ways. The first is to say that God is not really good. The pessimists say this, as, for example, Schopenhauer in his theory that life is caught in the grip of a capricious will. Hesiod says it in the lines: "Best of all for all things upon earth is it not to be born nor to behold the splendors of the sun; next best to traverse as soon as possible the gates of Hades."¹⁴ Karl Barth would consider it unfair to compare him with this type of pessimist, since he believes in the revelation of a saving God. Yet when he says that God's will is sovereign in the sense of

¹³ Quoted by William Orton, *America in Search of Culture*, p. 185.

¹⁴ Hesiod, *Theogonis*, lines 425-428.

indifferent to our reason or our ideas of goodness, it is hard to see why he is not also saying that the power which controls our destinies is from our point of view capricious and therefore unreliable.

The second and most familiar solution is that evil is not really evil. Leibnitz's idea of the best of all possible worlds is the stock example here. Augustine will not say that evil is good any more than that black is white, but he does say that it is good that evil is, just as Royce says that evil is good—to overcome. All solutions of this type are wrecked on the obstacle noted above. As a possibility evil may be necessary for a good world, but as an actual experience it infects the totality to which it contributes. Further, the distribution of evil poses an unsolved problem, as Voltaire well knew. The goodness of the good which some attain is qualified by the fact that the price was paid by others. Or if we say that evil is an illusion, then the illusion itself is an evil, and we fail again to reach a harmony.

It is better to accept the third solution which holds that God is not really all-powerful,—not really an Absolute Mind or an absolutely effective will. This means that God is not really the God of the theologians, but rather the God of the more humane philosophers, like Plato, Hume, Mill, James, Whitehead, and Brightman. If God is limited, neither the problem of the theologians nor that of the more rationalistic philosophers is solved with the completeness that might be wished. The pieces do not fit together whether the principle of inclusion be the sovereign will of God or the absolute reason. But this theoretical instability seems actually to be necessary both for the moral and the religious life. If God is one among others, suffering in his own inadequacy, he is no longer a principle of explanation but by that fact may become an object of devotion. His absoluteness of value is not lost but made more secure in the very circumstance that he is not the absolute of existence.

Suffering, then, should point to the most intelligible and experienceable of all universals—the social—and should show us how to work our way into the real inner significance of community life. Suffering is itself relieved when shared. As Edgar says in *King Lear*,

But then the mind much sufferance doth o'erskip
When grief hath mates and bearing fellowship.¹⁵

But if suffering wins relief in the shared experience, and if, further, it offers a means to greater devotion to the common good, should not a religion of suffering love like Christianity be a more

¹⁵ *King Lear*, Act III, Scene 6.

aggressive force for unity? How can it do its work successfully if it returns to an Augustinian and Calvinistic emphasis on sin with all the sectarian partisanship which such an emphasis must bring in its train? How can it hope to bind up the wounds of a desperate and disillusioned humanity if it insists that acceptance of a particular theology must precede admission to the religious community? If Christianity as the religion of the Cross is to prepare itself to express the insights yielded by the experience of suffering, it must take more account of the aspirations of humanity as a whole. Love must suffer long, seeking not its own or any sectarian objective. Love must disclose itself as a quality which is not imposed on human life by any authoritarian or sovereign will but which grows out of our experience of our common need. Religion must show that the ideal has its roots in the conditions which man faces as man and in the struggling growth toward the light which he shares with his fellow men. The Greek sculptors and philosophers were right when they took their ideal standards from the dynamic symmetry which the growing body shares with all living things, not from geometrical abstractions nor yet from the stunted perversions suggested by an overemphasis on sin.

In conclusion we may take account of the remark of Professor Hocking that it is the will which by its decisive fiat translates the universal into the particular, idea into action. Supplementing this may we not say that love, as the emotion which yields to what is greater than the individual, translates the particular again into the universal? Since love is active as well as passive, it retains an element of will, and individuality is not lost. But the particularity of the self is overcome and true individuality is gained. Religion will miss its greatest opportunity if it fails to show the common bond to which the common experience of suffering and disillusionment may lead. Sin divides, and a theology based on the idea of sin, no matter how constructive its purpose, can end only by making men more conscious of their estrangement from one another and from God. Suffering unites, and a theology devoted to the task of bringing out its implications might contribute to a truly and completely ecumenical movement. Unamuno has expressed a truth that our age is ready to understand in the words: "Suffering is that which unites all living beings together; it is the universal or divine blood that flows through us all."

SELF-PITY IN THE PSALMS

OVID R. SELLERS

Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago

IN FOLK songs a common motif is martyrdom. This is true of both the synthetic pseudo folk songs that adenoidal contraltos with swing bands cast into the ether and the real folk songs that the hillbillies compose after tradition going back to Elizabethan England. The mournful Elizabethan ballad itself was no new invention, but a form of composition taking its origins in France, Italy, and Spain. It would be possible to develop a hypothesis tracing the ancestry of our modern blues song through the mediæval Arabic, early Arabic, hellenistic Greek, and classical Greek to the ancient Orient. The Egyptian *Song of the Harper* and the *Dialogue of a Misanthrope with His Soul* could be presented as emotional progenitors of *Gloomy Sunday* and *I'm So Sorry for Myself*. It is more likely, however, that in the school of self-pity, as it is called by Sigmund Spaeth in *Weep Some More My Lady*, is a development natural in any human society where man has thwarted ambitions and unsatisfied longings. And, as would be expected, this school is well represented in the Old Testament from Adam's wistful "The woman whom thou gavest me, she gave me and I did eat," to the complaint heard by Malachi, "What profit is it that we have kept his ordinance?"

Psychologists, professional and amateur, have pointed out the martyr complex as revealed in some of the Old Testament, in the gospels, and in Paul's epistles. It figures in Job and Lamentations, particularly the third chapter. In the Psalms there is a great deal more of it than one would naturally expect, especially when we consider that Psalms was used as a hymn book and that the Jews characterized the book by the title "Praises" (*Tehillim*).

We are not concerned here with the penitential element. In three of the most beautiful of our penitential Psalms—32, 51, and 130—there is no note of self-pity. In these the psalmist, whether speaking as an individual for himself or as a representative of the nation, tells of severe and pitiful suffering, but this suffering is on account of his own missteps and he prays earnestly for forgiveness. Incidentally, one of the seven Psalms classed by the church as penitential, Psalm 102, is not really penitential. The psalmist or his nation is suffering because of Yahweh's indignation and the malevolence of enemies, but there is no intimation that the distress is the result of sin and no plea for forgiveness. The theme, like that in many other Psalms, is injured innocence.

This attitude of injured innocence is one that recurs again and again

through the Psalms. It can be distinguished in seventy-seven,¹ slightly more than half of those in the entire book.

One subject of our self-pity folk songs we do not find in the Psalms. That is unrequited love. We get this in the prophets—particularly Hosea, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel—but there it is Yahweh who is the wronged party and the nation is the wanton. In the Psalms, as in some of our folk songs—such as *The Miner's Prayer*, *The Prisoner's Song*, and a good many of our spirituals—what causes self-pity is economic, political, or military oppression. In a few cases the psalmist seems to be sick. His bones are vexed, his eye waxeth old, his strength faileth, and there is no rest in his bones; his wounds stink and are corrupt; his loins are filled with a burning. Probably Psalm 38 is the most complete picture of a man beset by physical infirmities. Still it is not clear that these descriptions of bodily illness are to be taken literally. Even Psalm 38 has indications that a good part of the trouble at least is due to enemies and adversaries: "My enemies . . . are strong; and they that hate me wrongfully are multiplied" (v. 19). It is possible that in picturing his own somatic afflictions the poet is really referring to his nation's oppression by the heathen. But, whether or not the Psalms in question have national significance, the imagery is that of a man who feels that somebody has done him wrong.

As most of us recognize, it is hazardous to attempt any classification of the Psalms on the basis of date of composition. They were revised and rearranged while they were handed down. As we have them they represent the expression of the community considerably after the exile, though they doubtless contain passages going back even into pre-Israelite times. At any rate there is no indication that the self-pity Psalms were produced more abundantly at one time than another. We find the martyr motif in Psalms called Davidic by those who believe there are any Davidic Psalms² as well as in the Psalms which until recently were classified as Maccabean.³ Throughout the history of Israel there was political and economic oppression as well as individual psychosis.

Nor is there much to be gained by considering the distribution of the self-pity Psalms through the collection. It is true that in Book IV only three Psalms of the seventeen show any complaint over unfair

¹ Psalms containing expressions of self-pity are: (in Book I) 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41; (in Book II) 42, 43, 44, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 69, 70, 71; (in Book III) 73, 74, 77, 79, 80, 83, 85, 86, 88, 89; (in Book IV) 90, 94, 102; (in Book V) 107, 108, 109, 116, 118, 119, 120, 123, 124, 126, 129, 131, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144. Self-pity is not strongly expressed in 28, 30, 34, 36, 61, 62, 63, 66, and 131; but it is clear enough to warrant inclusion of these Psalms in our list. In the other sixty-eight the motif of self-pity is unmistakable.

² Psalm 18, the one considered most likely to be Davidic, is in our list.

³ Psalms 44, 74, 79, and 83, which until the last few years were held by many to be the most certainly Maccabean, all express self-pity.

treatment; but this book contains the collection of Hallelujah Psalms, which naturally would have nothing of the kind. Book I has twenty-six self-pity Psalms out of forty-one; Book II, seventeen out of thirty; Book III, ten out of eighteen; and Book V, twenty-one out of forty-four. So the distribution is fairly even.

The psychological set of the authors of the Psalms in question leads them to see persecution in their environment. No doubt in many instances the persecution was very real, and no doubt poets who had not experienced much persecution themselves had heard about it even in times of security and prosperity. Our blues songs lost none of their popularity in the booming twenties.

Now a striking difference between the self-pity Psalms and our lugubrious folk songs lies in the disposition of the Psalms to be optimistic in the face of persecution. Of the seventy-seven Psalms with self-pity all but fifteen express a cheery confidence that Yahweh will make all things right.⁴ And of these fifteen all contain prayers for help, though they give no evidence of expectation that the prayers will be answered. Even Psalm 88, which is one of the most hopeless, contains the petition, "Let my prayer come before thee; incline thine ear to my cry." And Psalm 123 beseeches, "Have mercy upon us, O Lord; have mercy upon us."

The pattern is set in Psalm 3, which evidently was the first Psalm in the first book before Psalms 1 and 2, which have no titles, were added. It begins with self-pity:

Yahweh, how are my persecutions increased.
Many are rising up against me.
Many are saying to my soul,
"There's no salvation for him in God."

But straightway there is the negation of misfortune:

But thou, Yahweh, art a shield for me,
My glory and the lifter up of my head.

There continues an expression of supreme trust with the request for Yahweh to smite all the enemies on the cheek bone and to break the teeth of the ungodly.

This imprecatory note is very common in our self-pity Psalms. Forty-four of the seventy-seven have it.⁵ There is not much thought of mercy to enemies. Sixteen of these Psalms have definite declarations

⁴ These fifteen are Psalms 25, 38, 70, 74, 79, 80, 83, 88, 90, 120, 123, 131, 137, 141, 143.

⁵ Psalms 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 18, 27, 28, 31, 35, 36, 40, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 79, 83, 94, 108, 109, 118, 119, 120, 129, 136, 137, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144.

of self-righteousness,⁶ while only eleven have any hint of penitence or suspicion that the author's troubles were due to any fault of his own.⁷

There naturally rises the question as to whether some of the optimistic expressions of sure victory for the righteous may be due to later revising, whether many originally undiluted wails of despair were not negated by subsequent inspirational editors. This may have happened in some cases, but it seems that generally the hopeful expressions are integral parts of the poems. They fit into metrical schemes where metrical schemes can be defined and they certainly are not later additions to the acrostic Psalms 9-10, 25, 34, and 119, where we have expressions of both self-pity and ultimate optimism.

The Hebrew psalmist, then, was prone to complain, to feel that he was wrongfully used, that his God failed to appreciate his devotion, that he—a righteous man—was being persecuted by altogether wicked enemies. But no sooner had he uttered his complaint than he felt ashamed of himself and began to declare his confidence in Yahweh and the ultimate triumph of right. This combination of despair and hope came to be such a thought pattern that it was used consciously both by writers expressing the deepest feelings of their hearts and by those interested primarily in the mechanics of their compositions; *e.g.*, the writers of acrostics. It is true that it is not to be found in the Psalms that we consider generally the most beautiful—1, 8, 19, 23, 24, 91, 100, and 121. But it is found in some of the excellent Psalms read regularly in our churches, such as 3, 11, 22, 27. So we are justified in saying that one of the norms of Psalm writing was the expression of self-pity immediately corrected, however, by the declaration of basic trust in a benevolent God.

⁶ Psalms 7, 9, 11, 18, 20, 22, 34, 40, 44, 55, 64, 73, 86, 139, 140, 143.

⁷ Psalms 6, 25, 38, 39, 40, 41, 69, 79, 83, 90, 119.

ONE HOLY CHURCH

EDWIN L. CLARKE

Rollins College

THE SCANDAL of a church broken into jangling sects still affronts the world. Division cripples the work of what should be an incomparably strong organization, working for the transformation of society. Religious folk long for religious unity, but every group wants union on its own terms. Many formulas for making a united church have been offered. The fact that none has been accepted and that the need is urgent justifies yet another proposal.

The direction in which to move is suggested by work of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the National Conference of Jews and Christians, the repeated world conferences of diverse religions. Each of these organizations makes an attempt to leave non-essentials to the individual, to concentrate on central principles of religion which the largest possible group can accept. A program may be found by going beyond the attempts of these organizations, to something far more basic than what they have considered. It is a daring program, so revolutionary that some readers may go no further than the next paragraph. Let church and synagogue, yes, let mosque and temple reorient their teaching and their basis of membership. Let them shift their emphasis, as rapidly as the old in years and the fixed in mind will permit, until there is a real second birth of the church. Let them take and proclaim from the housetop some such stand as the following.

The members of this church are united by a fearless belief in the liberating power of truth, by a faith in the possibilities of human life, by their desire for an ideal social order. That order has been variously known by such names as the Kingdom of God, the Kingdom of Heaven, the Coöperative Commonwealth, the Fraternal State. Its essential feature is that all men shall treat each other as brothers, in the spirit of love.

The members of this church wish to coöperate with each other in holding this ideal before the world by word and example, in inspiring mankind to work for the ideal, in striving to live and to help others to live in accordance with the spirit of brotherly love.

They recognize that different persons, with different temperaments and experiences, have different methods of expressing their aspirations in worship, prayer, song, or otherwise, as they work for the establishment of the ideal social order. They welcome to their fellowship all persons, whatever their theology or philosophy, who are in sympathy with their aims, and who wish to work with them.

This reorientation would create a church truly universal. It would include in its membership Christians, Jews, Moslems, Confucianists;

theological believers, doubters, and disbelievers. No persons would be excluded, as they are in large numbers today, because they could not sincerely say of the theological creed of the church, "I believe"

Each church could still use whatever methods and forms were desired by its policy makers, whether its government were episcopal, congregational, or of some other type. Just as today in many a Protestant church a minister will baptize by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion, according to the belief and desire of the individual, in this church universal each traditional denomination could still be "high" or "low," according to the will of the people. Those who wished worship could have it. Those who wished to identify themselves with the church simply as the inspirer, teacher, and builder of the good life could do that, too. Naturally persons who prefer one type of organization, worship, or work would tend to unite with that group which appealed to them. One need not fear that "low church" people would invade "high church" organizations in large numbers; they would prefer to find fellowship elsewhere.

There is precedent for an organization of this kind. If most Americans were asked the question, "What church, other than your own, best exemplifies the principles of true religion?" they would probably answer, "The Quaker." The Friends, known the world around for their glorious work for the Fraternal State. The Friends, probably influential far beyond any others, in proportion to their numbers. The Friends, who do not ask candidates for membership about their theological beliefs, but who ask and expect only that they shall have a conscientious zeal to work for the kingdom of heaven on earth. If the term religious is used as broadly as the Friends use it, this is a highly religious plan.

The project is not simply a means of increasing the effectiveness of a vigorous and growing church. It is an essential to the very life of the church. Those who face reality with open eyes see that the church is slowly dwindling, in numbers and influence, in practically all of its divisions. Large congregations, magnificent sanctuaries, great endowments conceal the truth from only the shortsighted. The significant fact is that young people are not supporting the church. Sunday school membership and attendance are shrinking notably. Many scattered cases of strong, growing churches do not invalidate the general proposition. The church is slowly dying at the roots.

The situation is most acute where advanced education is most diffused. It is a matter of common observation that, in general, college students and teachers do not support organized religion. This observation is verified by the repeated studies of Dr. Leuba.¹ Highly educated

¹ "Modern Men and Religious Faith," *Survey Graphic*, XXVIII (April, 1939), pp. 277-279.

men and women less and less accept the traditional foundations of religion and less and less join and uphold the church. It is easy to foresee the state of the church, thirty years hence, when those who are now its strength are aged or gone. It will be but a shadow of its present self if it draws recruits only from its present prospective members, the declining numbers in its Sunday school.

Let it be granted that many young people are selfish and materialistic, and that others are too lazy to think through the problems of life. Nevertheless a significant minority of youth are keen, clean-minded and socially-minded persons. They believe in the principles of Isaiah and of Jesus, but they see in the church merely an organization dedicated to ceremony, worship, and futility, rather than to the aggressive promotion of the good life.

What must the church do to be saved, to win the support of these young, without whom it must perish? Inquiry among young people readily reveals the source of the difficulty. Educated youth accept the methods of science. Rightly or wrongly, they cannot reconcile much traditional theology with what they know of science. Further, many young people regard church folks as a company of innocents or hypocrites. They find them extolling Isaiah and Jesus, and neglecting the principles for which they lived and died. They maintain that it is impossible to tell from personal conduct whether or not one is a church member or a religious person in the usual sense of the term. Finally, they are not drawn to support even those individual churches and church leaders that they respect for their aggressive leadership in the struggle for a better world. They scorn pastoral apologetics for creeds. They cannot accept theological tests for membership and they are too honest to feign acceptance. In consequence, they view the church with indifference or contempt.

Various objections will be offered to our proposal. One is that the church must keep its continuity with the past. This is an appealing argument to many, but less important than the point that religion must gain continuity with the future. Today the churches have to choose between fearless adaptation and a lingering death. One may admire the tenacity of those who say, "The faith that was delivered to us we cannot change. Let the church perish, if that is the will of God. We have no authority to change her ancient ways." Those who hold that the supremely important thing is the kingdom, however, will think most of all of the years ahead. They will even be skeptical of their own power to speak with certainty of the will of God.

Another objection is that the kingdom is the kingdom of *God*, and that without emphasis on the worship of God there can be no kingdom.

This argument is appealing to many, also. We must acknowledge, however, that no men can know God. If they could, the world would have only one religion, even as now it has only one chemistry. The God that men worship is their concept of God. It is a very changing concept, and like every other human concept it may be wrong. Most historic churches strayed perhaps fatally from the path when they demanded of candidates for membership that they accept what is unproved and unprovable, namely, that the creed of Church A is true, while by inference the creed of Church B is only partly true or is altogether false. This policy has been responsible for a flood of bloodshed, from the day of Cain to the hour of Adolph Hitler. It is doubtful if any other belief has brought more suffering to humanity than the doctrine that people should be segregated into more or less hostile groups because they have different theological beliefs and worship in different ways.

It should be noted that the plan does not call for the end of worship, sacraments, or any other custom of a church, save that of creedal test for membership. The plan simply proposes that no one shall be excluded from membership and fellowship in the church, and full participation in the work for the kingdom, merely because of matters of theology. It seems to be in full harmony with the teaching of One who was more concerned with the spirit than the form, who condemned those who said "Lord, Lord," and did not the things which he said, and who praised those who helped their neighbors in distress, even though they had never verbally acknowledged his lordship. It could be accepted by all groups save those which assert unique possession of special revelation or authority. If it were accepted by any churches, it would mark progress away from current divisions.

Would the plan strengthen the church? What would happen to any communion that adopted the proposed reorientation? One can only point to the Friends for a likely answer. Such a church might lose a host of purely formal members, the worshippers of words, the people who talk about the kingdom but who do not want it to come if it would deprive them of privileged seats at life's feast. These folks, and others, would denounce and fight it as having become atheistic.

One cannot guarantee that youth would throng to such a church. One can well believe that many young people would be won by a far bolder program than that which the church now offers. Youth is not necessarily afraid of hard and dangerous tasks. Many almost welcome great sacrifice in a great cause. Garibaldi recruited his army to make a united Italy, though he promised his soldiers only hunger, cold, hardship, and battle. The struggle for the kingdom of love is no less difficult, but the goal is infinitely greater. The campaign can offer difficul-

ties and suffering, and still draw men to participate in it. One does not follow the road of the social reformer for the sake of an easy life, but millions of youth, the world around, have chosen that way. If the church is true to its best self, it may yet draw all mankind unto itself.

After all, however, the basic problem is not "What must the church do to be saved?" Psychologists as well as religionists know the profound spiritual truth in the simple statement, "He that saveth his life shall lose it, but he that loseth his life shall find it." Unfortunately there seem to be about ninety-nine chances in the hundred that the church will think first of all of saving itself, and will slowly perish. True, it is gradually developing a kingdom-building program, but it still insists that those who would affiliate themselves with it shall accept a traditional theology, whichever one of the two hundred-odd American denominational creeds it may be. So the youth of the nation shake their heads and pass by. Some of them are in search of a thrill. The church might help them, but it cannot get their attention. Others are on their way to build the kingdom, and without the church! They are as little interested in creeds, denominations, and orthodoxy as they are in the question of dancing space for angels on a needle's point!

The kingdom will be built. Its foundations are being laid, day by day. In such organizations as the Friends' Service Committee, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the *Catholic Worker*, and the coöperative movement, young people are beginning to find the work they seek. What if the church should perish and the kingdom should be built without it!

A FRESH VIEW OF THE INTRODUCTION TO PAUL'S LETTERS

DONALD W. RIDDLE

University of Chicago

PROFESSOR JOHN KNOX recently offered a new study of Pauline chronology.¹ His article has definite implication for the reopening of questions of introduction to Paul's letters. It is the purpose of this paper to point out some methodological factors, and to outline certain results which may obtain from the application of Dr. Knox's fresh view.

The manifest value of Knox's chronology is that difficulties in Pauline introduction and biography disappear when it is applied. When II Cor. 12:2 and Gal. 2:1 are understood as almost contemporary references to the same event, that event being Paul's so-called conversion, it follows that Paul's revolutionary experience occurred later than it can be dated by fitting the statements of his letters into the schema of Acts. Paul's "conversion" is thus seen to have occurred late enough for Christianity's transition to gentile environments to have been under way for some time. The event itself is easier to understand. And the bearing of this factor upon the dates of his letters is equally important.

Dr. Knox's chronology was adopted and applied in my *Paul, Man of Conflict*,² primarily as an aspect of Paul's biography, secondarily (in Appendix II) with reference to the problems of introduction. It was observed that following the Jerusalem conference mentioned in Gal. 2:1-10 a great crisis in Paul's work occurred. This crisis was taken as a criterion by which the sequence and the relative dates of the letters may be determined. Letters which reflect the crisis as it obtained can be identified. By the same token, letters which do not reflect it may be analyzed to determine whether they were written before or after.

It was thus suggested that Paul's letters were written in the following sequence, falling into four groups: I and II Thessalonians (accepting the genuineness of the latter) do not reflect the crisis, and their contents indicate that they were written before it. It is possible that part of Philippians was written during this period. The "imprisonment letters" (part or parts of Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon) came next, during an imprisonment in Ephesus. Perhaps the letter referred to in I Cor. 5:9 was written during this imprisonment. The canonical I Corinthians followed, after Paul's release. It is possible that I Cor.

¹ "Fourteen Years Later, a Note on the Pauline Chronology," *Journal of Religion*, XVI (1936), pp. 341-349; "The Pauline Chronology," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LVIII (1939), pp. 15-30.

² Nashville, 1940.

9 does not belong to the original "I Corinthians," but is all that remains of a letter written between I Corinthians and the next group. This next group are the letters which reflect the crisis as it occurred: II Cor. 10-13; Gal.; Phil. 3:2-16; and II Cor. 1-9. The silence of Romans as to the crisis, and internal indicia, suggest that Romans appeared after the crisis, and was thus Paul's latest letter. To be separated from its present place as Rom. 16 is the letter (perhaps including other fragments) of introduction of Phœbe to the Ephesian church.

There is general agreement that I and II Thessalonians are Paul's first letters. I Thessalonians, even though II Thessalonians be regarded as ungenuine, plainly reflects Paul's preaching in Macedonia, and the contents suggest that I Thessalonians was written in Corinth. But it does not follow that Paul wrote at the juncture which is suggested by Acts 18:1, 5—*i.e.*, at the time of his first visit to Corinth. Goodspeed, for example,³ dates the letter shortly before the arrival of Gallio in Corinth, assuming that Paul's appearance before him was at the time of his first visit there. This, of course, is merely the harmonization of Paul's letters to Acts. If Paul was brought before Gallio, it might have been on one of his subsequent visits to Corinth. Indeed, a time somewhat later than that suggested by Acts 18:1 (not assuming that this date was 49) suits the particular point of I Thes. 4:13—5:11 better; surely a certain amount of time between Paul's leaving Thessalonica and the writing of I Thessalonians is needed for the questions about the end of the age to have arisen, for it is clearly implied that a number of the Thessalonians had died, and there is no need for assuming that an epidemic had occurred.

Furthermore, the reference to "persecution" in I Thessalonians cannot be harmonized with Acts. In the letter it is said that the difficulties arose from relations between the church people and gentiles, while the Acts account—in accord with its consistent tendency—charges the troubles to "the Jews."

A fresh view may agree with old views that the Thessalonian letters were Paul's earliest, but this does not mean, necessarily, that their dates were 49 and shortly after. The dates may have been earlier. Very probably I Thessalonians was written later than Acts 18:1 suggests, but what was that date? To fix it by the Gallio episode is gratuitous. Acts relates all of Paul's activities in Corinth—at least all those which had to do with evangelization and the direction of the church there—as though they occurred on a single visit. Paul's letters clearly reflect three visits. The Gallio episode may well have occurred on the second one.

³ *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Chicago, 1937), p. 10.

The view that Philippians is composite is by no means new. But the fact may be profitably applied in a fresh view of Pauline introduction. It is probable that reëxamination will go farther than old views in the partitioning of the canonical letter. As has been mentioned, the sequence set forth in *Paul, Man of Conflict* relates 3:2-16 to a later situation. The sections reflecting imprisonment (1:12-18 or 30; 4:10-20) are readily isolated. But dividing the letter thus does not account for all of it. If 3:1 is correctly translated "Good bye in the Lord," and if this, together with the obvious absence of transition, is taken as indicating the end of a fragment, then by the same token the end of another fragment is indicated at 4:4. Thus there is evidence that Philippians consists of more than two parts. It is to be hoped that the several parts may be correctly identified and related to their situations.

A detail is worthy of mention. Knox's work on the collecting and editing of Paul's letters⁴ enables a satisfactory answer to the otherwise insoluble problem of the reference to *episcopoi* in Phil. 1:1. When it is seen that this word, with the whole beginning of the canonical letter, may thus be referred to the editor, it may follow that the "bishops," who were certainly known as such when the letters were collected and edited, need not be looked for in the situation of the Philippian correspondence itself.

The hypothesis of an Ephesian imprisonment of Paul is not new. But this also may contribute to a fresh view of Pauline introduction. To use it as the setting of the imprisonment letters necessarily dates the fragments of Philippians which were written from prison, and similarly dates Colossians and Philemon. The date thus required is earlier than that usually assigned. But the advantages of the hypothesis of an Ephesian imprisonment are obvious. When it is remembered that the communication implied between Paul and the Philippians involves three passages of information (news of Paul's imprisonment came to the Philippians, they send a gift to him, he writes to them), the advantage of Ephesus over Rome is obvious indeed. Likewise the suitability of similar relationship between Ephesus and Colossæ as against Rome and Colossæ is plain. It is much more probable that a slave absconded from Colossæ (or Laodicea) would find his way to Ephesus than to Rome.

But the usual objection to the Ephesian imprisonment as the place and time of writing of Colossians (and the other imprisonment letters as well) is the necessary implication of an earlier date. This objection,

⁴ *Philemon among the Letters of Paul* (Chicago, 1936); "A Conjecture as to the Original Status of II Corinthians and II Thessalonians in the Pauline Corpus," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LV (1936), pp. 145-163.

whether consciously or unconsciously, is based upon the judgment that there was a development in Paul's thought. Professor Lake implies this in his distinction between the earlier and later epistles, R. H. Charles makes the point explicitly, and A. D. Nock more recently uses it.

But the idea is gratuitous. On linguistic grounds Lightfoot long ago placed Philippians as early. No "development" can be demonstrated, for none occurred.⁵ The alleged late ideas are to be found in those letters which are conceded to have been early. Charles thought that he could distinguish early, late, and two middle stages in Paul's eschatology. Similar distinctions in Paul's Christology have been asserted. But Christ was to Paul a cosmic figure at all times subsequent to his "conversion," and he appears as such in all the letters. There is not the slightest ground for concluding that Paul could not have held the Christology of Phil. 2: 5-11 at the time he wrote the earliest letter. By the same token, there is no "higher" Christology in Colossians, as against a "lower" Christology in earlier letters.

The apparent Hellenism in Colossians, particularly its quasi-Gnosticism, has influenced several scholars to deny the authenticity of the letter altogether, and has led others to seek as late a date in Paul's life for it as is possible. But Lohmeyer's thorough study of the religious background of the letter⁶ has fully established the fact that such a syncretistic religion existed during Paul's lifetime. Thus, so far as this is a factor, an early date suits as well as a later one. The quasi-Gnosticism cannot be alleged as a factor requiring a later date for Colossians.

Obviously Luke-Acts fails the student who searches for the situation of the writing of Colossians, since it does not refer to Colossæ. Internal data indicate that Paul had not founded the church there; it is an easy inference that Epaphras did so. But the close relation between Colossians and Philemon (and between Colossæ and Laodicea) are important data in determining the various factors of introduction to these letters. The intimacy of the relations between Paul and the people (and church) addressed in Philemon balances and compensates for the impersonality of the relations between Paul and the Colossians.

As for the difficulty involved in Paul's apparent adoption of the syncretistic hellenistic elements in the religion of the Colossians, this, in turn, is an aspect of the important and difficult question of the influence of Paul's hellenistic environment upon him. In this matter, as is well

⁵ The idea implies, also, another view which was formerly accepted, that there was a lengthy period (fourteen or seventeen years) of "preparation" before any of Paul's letters were written. This, obviously, is the result of harmonization. There is nothing in the primary sources even to suggest it. The idea should be abandoned.

⁶ Meyer Commentary, Göttingen, 1930.

known, there is wide and violent disagreement. Some deny any such influence, others affirm it; a few find this to be the primary factor in Paul's life. It has even been alleged that Paul joined a mystery cult.⁷ With reference to Colossians in particular it has been claimed that the language indicates that Paul had read and was thus influenced by Aristophanes.⁸

Extreme statements like these, some of which are no more than vagaries, should not be allowed to obscure the plain fact that Paul was profoundly influenced by his gentile environment. It is true that the basis of Paul's religion was Judaism, and that he thought of himself always as a Jew. Yet there was much in his religion which came from non-Jewish sources. The language of his letters furnishes much evidence, and many of his ideas are not understandable otherwise. Passages which closely parallel the imagery of the mystery cults are strikingly significant. One of these is found in Colossians (2:12; cf. Rom. 6:3-6). Paul's conception of baptism and the Lord's supper must be considered, particularly with reference to their nature; if these were sacraments, two conclusions follow: they were un-Jewish in origin, and their functional parallel with the mystery cults is plain. These features suggest gentile origin.

Similarly the philosophical language and concepts of Colossians reflect syncretism. To be sure, it is sometimes said that Paul was merely using the language which his readers used, without adopting the positions which the terms involve. But this is palpable evasion. In the letter there is a plain adaptation of the conception of Jesus and the processes of the religious life to the thought of the quasi-Gnostic philosophical-religious cults. The only question is whether Paul adopted the conceptions from his gentile environment. It is difficult, if not impossible, to see whence else he could have derived them.

Lohmeyer has demonstrated that people in Paul's day had syncretized religion so that the quasi-Gnostic elements reflected in Colossians were common. It is plain, too, that Paul found it possible and valuable to state his evangelic message in such terms. Obviously Paul was not a philosopher; metaphysical speculation was not congenial to him. To him religion was a much better way. But certainly Paul had a mysticism, and upon occasion (cf. I Cor. 2:6-16) he articulated it in quasi-philosophical terms.

Its basis involved his conceiving of Jesus in utterly cosmic scope, both as to nature and as to his saving work. It should not seem strange to modern readers that this Christ-mysticism corresponds to gentile

⁷ Macchioro, *From Orpheus to Paul* (New York, 1930).

⁸ Harris, "St. Paul and Aristophanes," *Expository Times*, XXIV (1923), pp. 151-156.

thought. Paul was sufficiently aware of his world, although his apocalypticism logically implied his repudiation of it, for a sharing of the gentile world view to have been a necessary consequence of his experience. His religious experience involved a sharing of religious conceptions of other people, Jews and non-Jews alike.

One such shared concept was the notion of *ta stoicheia tou kosmou*, "the elements of the world" (Col. 2:8). It is significant that Paul uses this concept in Gal. 4:9. To some extent this suggests the nearness in time of these letters.⁹

It is unnecessary, so fully and so well has Knox worked out the problems, to discuss Philemon. But such dismissal is not to be taken as implying its unimportance.¹⁰ Further, Goodspeed's treatment of the letter¹¹ greatly assists in understanding its correct relationship with other Pauline letters in problems of introduction. It is a letter to a church, whether or not one follows Goodspeed's identification of this church as that in Laodicea. For the present purpose it is sufficient to reiterate that its data so closely correlate with those of Colossians that its problems are readily worked out.

Much of the critically orthodox work on the Corinthian correspondence can be utilized in fresh views of the introduction to these letters. That II Cor. 6:14—7:1 is a fragment of a letter written before I Corinthians (probably the same as that mentioned in I Cor. 5:9) is widely accepted. It was suggested above that it was written during Paul's Ephesian imprisonment. An attractive view, not commonly held, is that I Cor. 9 (at least 1-23) should also be partitioned from the remainder of the letter in which it stands, and referred to a somewhat later time. This view is usefully related to the Knox-Riddle chronology and the special reference to the crisis in Paul's work. That II Cor. 10-13 reflects extreme strain between Paul and the Corinthians, or some of them, has long been seen. It may well be that this was a phase of the same problem as that of the Galatian letter; thus the tone and content of I Cor. 9:1-23 can be fitted into the situation as reflecting an intermediate stage in the growth of the strain and the ensuing crisis.

One of the dissents from the position maintained in *Paul, Man of Conflict*, however, does not accept this judgment; it is doubted by some that the crisis in Corinth was the "Jewish problem" involved in Galatians. Nevertheless, it is apparent that in Paul's vehement rhetorical questions,

⁹ As a problem of introduction, the presence in Colossians of the "table of household duties" (3:18—4:1) is difficult; it is the most serious obstacle to the recognition of the genuineness of the letter. On the other hand, this feature in a genuine letter strongly bears out the fact of syncretism, for it is an obvious instance of the influence of Stoicism upon Paul.

¹⁰ This is an inescapable implication of the treatment of Philemon in a mere few lines by Lake and Lake, *Introduction* (New York, 1937), p. 150.

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 109-124; cf. *New Chapters in New Testament Study* (New York, 1938).

"Are they Hebrews? Are they Israelites? Are they descendants of Abraham?" (II Cor. 11:22), one must see that one of the several issues between Paul and some of the Corinthians involved Jews, and that Jewish opponents were a factor in the situation. This must mean that Corinth had been visited by Jewish propagandists who opposed Paul and questioned his apostleship—just as had occurred in Galatia.

Now, I Cor. 9:1-23 is also highly defensive in tone and purpose. As in Galatians, Paul defends his apostleship, which had been questioned, "Even if I am not an apostle to others, I am to you, at least" (9:2). He defends himself against those who examine him, as he does in Galatians. He insists that to the Jews he became a Jew. The problem of the law figures (9:20f.). Is it not illuminating to regard this section as reflecting an intermediate stage in the development of strain between Paul and the Corinthians?

Thus one can see this sequence in Paul's Corinthian letters: the letter referred to in I Cor. 5:9 (which may survive in part in II Cor. 6:14—7:1), I Cor. (minus chapter 9, or 9:1-23), a letter of which I Cor. 9 (or 9:1-23) is a fragment, II Cor. 10-13, II Cor. 1-9.

As to the relative time, the letter mentioned in I Cor. 5:9 may have been written during Paul's Ephesian imprisonment. I Cor. was written after Paul's release, since 15:32 refers to the event. Except as I Cor. 9:1-23 is viewed as reflecting an intermediate stage in the development of strain, I Corinthians does not reflect the crisis. This is so plainly reflected in II Cor. 10:13, Gal., and Phil. 3:2-16 that this group of letters stands out plainly from the others.

Another question which has arisen in dissent from the position stated in *Paul, Man of Conflict* concerns the bearing of the reference to the collection in I Cor. 16:1-9 upon the date of I Corinthians. The view there sketched suggested that I Corinthians was written not only before the crisis had developed, but before the visit to Jerusalem mentioned in Gal. 2:1-10, so that the letter was written, presumably, not long after Paul's release from the Ephesian imprisonment. It has been objected, particularly by Professor Minear, that the reference to the collection decisively dates I Corinthians after the Jerusalem conference, since it was only in response to the obligation which Paul accepted that he initiated this type of financial work. The point is debatable, and must be determined upon examination of all the evidence. However, it seems likely that complete examination of all the data will require the assignment of I Corinthians to a time subsequent to the Jerusalem conference, but before the "breaking" of the crisis. It is of assistance to this view to regard I Cor. 9:1-23 as intermediate between the remainder of I Cor. and II Cor. 10-13.

The determination of the relative date of Galatians by reference to the crisis makes it impossible to accept it as Paul's first letter, as is done by a few scholars.¹² Their judgment is only a logical consequence of the harmonization of Paul's letters with Acts. It involves the problem of squaring Paul's statements about his visits to Jerusalem with the statements of Acts, and thus requires the view that Galatians was written before the conference of Acts 15. There are insuperable difficulties in this; the harmonization which promises to solve problems leaves some unsolved and raises others. It is much simpler and advantageous, as well as methodologically proper, to refrain from harmonization, and obtain generalizations inductively from the data of the primary sources.

The Knox-Riddle association of the experience mentioned in II Cor. 12:2 with that referred to in Gal. 2:1 (and 1:12, 16), and the identification of this experience as Paul's so-called conversion solves more problems than does any other chronology, and raises no questions which cannot be answered. By the same token it may be affirmed that the recognition of the crisis as a focal point in Paul's life and work, and the use of it as a criterion of the sequence of the letters, is an efficient tool in a fresh view of Pauline introduction.

The reference of Phil. 3:2-16 to this point is also entirely defensible. Since the "Jewish question" does not otherwise impinge upon the Philippian correspondence, it is, indeed, the best way to understand this section. It is a warning; not that the Philippians are encountering the Jewish propaganda which is disaffecting the Corinthians and the Galatians, but prophylactic in case it should impinge upon them.

II Cor. 1-9 may be placed in this sequence on the critically orthodox view. It reflects the crisis in close retrospect, and shows that the Corinthians had accepted Paul's instruction. One may wish for parallel information of the outcome of the crisis in the Galatian churches, but the student is not so favored in this case. Other elements in II Cor. 1-9 are of the highest value for their information concerning the general situation and for what they reveal of Paul as a person.

The chief feature of placing Romans as Paul's latest letter, and of understanding it as "a survey, an estimate, a prospect," is that the letter so viewed is not one of the "earlier epistles." But, as has been said, all attempts to distinguish between earlier and later letters on the basis of alleged development in Paul's thought fail of demonstration. The clinching datum for the judgment that Romans is the latest letter is what is said in 15:30-32. With this the situation clearly reflected in 9-11 closely accords. These chapters show that Paul's "Christianity,"

¹² E.g., by Emmett, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (London, 1912); Duncan, *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians* (New York, 1934).

and emerging Christianity generally, is gentile; the response of Jews has been so negligible that Paul is hard put to it to explain the fact. The closing section of the letter shows with sombre certainty that Paul expected trouble when he reached Jerusalem with the money for poor relief. These statements are, indeed, motifs of the tragic interlude between Paul's evangelistic activity and the events which led to his death.

There are, of course, many other factors which a fresh view of Pauline introduction must consider. Ephesians is not discussed here, since Professor Goodspeed's¹³ treatment of it is followed. Archæology must be taken into account. The criteria of literary form must be applied. Bultmann's work on the diatribe,¹⁴ Schubert's study of the thanksgivings,¹⁵ and Weidinger's book on the *haustafeln*¹⁶ are examples. A study of Paul's parænesis is greatly needed.

The purpose of this paper, however, has been to show the shortcomings of the harmonization of Paul's letters to Acts as the prime method in introduction, and to offer an example of the bearing of Knox's chronology. It is not assumed that freshness is a value in itself; new views which are merely bizarre are not likely to assist in understanding Paul's letters. But actual harm is done by harmonization, and the various possible chronologies ought to be examined to determine their merits. The growing acceptance of the Ephesian imprisonment hypothesis should be welcomed. Further work will derive much from studies already made,¹⁷ e.g., future work on Colossians must utilize Lohmeyer's brilliant study.¹⁸ It is to be hoped that from the storehouse new things and old things may be taken to provide a fresh view of the introduction to Paul's letters.

¹³ *The Meaning of Ephesians* (Chicago, 1933); *Introduction* (Chicago, 1937).

¹⁴ *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe* (Göttingen, 1910).

¹⁵ *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings* (Berlin, 1939).

¹⁶ *Die Haustafeln* (Göttingen, 1927).

¹⁷ The Lüttgert-Ropes contributions to the study of Galatians and other letters must also be used. They were not applied in *Paul, Man of Conflict*; doubtless they should have been. No repudiation was intended; neglect was not implied.

¹⁸ *Op. cit.* in n. 6.

KEACH—WHITEFIELD—RIPPON

A By-path in Early Hymnody

W. T. WHITLEY

Essex, England

SPURGEON'S church at the Metropolitan Tabernacle has a double anniversary to celebrate in 1941; and each event shows Baptists pioneering in worship, setting an example that is now followed by all Christians. The first book of hymns to replace Psalms was published 250 years ago, by Benjamin Keach, father of that Elias Keach who did good work round Philadelphia. The first collection of tunes from many sources, for a whole congregation to sing, was compiled for John Rippon 150 years ago, by Robert Keen, his precentor, the close friend and executor of George Whitefield, whose journeys from Savannah to Newburyport started Baptists on their home mission work across America. A short account of each enterprise may show how these two London beginnings have quickened brethren on the Atlantic seaboard.

The founders of Massachusetts brought with them the habit of singing metrical Psalms; but the versions by Sternhold, Whittingham, Hopkins, and others were a century old, made by men who knew little or no Hebrew, so that they simply versified the prose of Coverdale, who himself had translated from versions into Dutch and Latin. The third-hand Psalter did not satisfy Henry Ainsworth, who studied under Jewish teachers at Amsterdam and translated direct from the Hebrew. Unfortunately his accurate version was not as readable as Coverdale's, nor even as poetical as Sternhold's. So his Psalter was superseded in 1640 by a local revision, the *Bay Psalm Book*, the third edition of which was edited and augmented with scriptural hymns by Henry Dunster, president of Harvard—soon to be Baptist.

All these translators were trammelled by the idea of Calvin, that Scripture alone must provide the material of praise. They did not follow the example of Luther, who wrote perfectly original hymns, two for Christmas being used in America as

Good news from heaven the angels bring.
To shepherds as they watched by night.

Another was translated in Scotland in the days of Mary Stuart,

Christ baptist was be Johne in Jordan flude;

and again in America nearly three centuries later,

To Jordan came our Lord the Christ.

In neither case was there a Baptist who rubbed in the precedent, to ask that baptism should be on profession of faith. The abundant hymns of the Anabaptists or Mennonites along the Rhine did not find their way into English till they themselves translated them last century in Pennsylvania. Nor were the Puritans of Milton's time at all prone to take example from the Middle Ages, whether to translate their Latin hymns, or to express their own piety in their own words.

This freedom was exercised first by Benjamin Keach in 1673. It was a year of liberty, for King Charles had made the greatest of his efforts towards religious peace by issuing his Declaration of Indulgence. Keach at once introduced public singing, of his own original hymns. To his church he justified the innovation by pointing out that in Jerusalem, on the night in which Christ was betrayed, he and his loyal disciples sang a hymn together after they had supped. So he composed hymns which were used after each repetition of the Lord's supper; the ideas of the sermon were versified, and dictated two lines at a time that they should be sung and thus would be remembered better. Here is one specimen—

Bless'd be the Lamb that hither came
To be a Sacrifice;
'Tis by thy Blood we have all good,
In thee all Blessing lyes.

For us he dy'd, being crucify'd,
Sustain'd that cruel death;
Was broke with grief, us'd as a Thief,
And gave up his sweet breath.

The next step was naturally to sing at baptisms; after a sermon on "Grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption," the congregation added its voice to the candidates:

Hath any promise been set home
With power on your heart?
Did ever so God's Spirit come
His Image to impart?

O what Impression do you find?
Is holiness in you?
Do you now in the Lord delight
More than in things below?

Take care you who are sealed Once
Ye don't the Spirit grieve;
Don't make him sigh with bitter groans
Since such a Seal ye have.

The practice widened, to special occasions, to every service. Within four years, the pastor of the older church in Wapping, who had been asked to prepare a *Confession for Baptists*, stated in Chapter XXII, which dealt with religious worship, "The reading of the scriptures, preaching, and hearing the word of God, teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in our Hearts unto the Lord . . . are all parts of Religious worship of God, to be performed in obedience to him." This thought he soon expanded in a catechism he was asked to prepare; and thus Baptist children were taught to say that public singing of hymns was a duty to God. Naturally other London churches adopted the practice, and when Kiffin's meeting-house, which had been confiscated for Anglicans after the Great Fire had burned their churches, was restored to its owners, the congregation triumphantly celebrated the occasion with song, and entered the fact in their minutes.

Keach's example was followed in his native county of Buckingham. Within ten miles of Stoke Hammond his birthplace, and of Winslow his first pastorate, is another hamlet named Stantonbury, where John Mason was vicar. This man was not, as often stated, the son of a dissenting minister, for no man of that name was ejected; he seems rather to be related to Joseph Mason, a deacon in the London church whose pastor Henry Jessey died in 1671; he certainly shared many of Jessey's views and tastes. In the year when Keach began inducing his church to sing the hymns he wrote, Mason moved to Water Stratford, even nearer Winslow. As Keach kept in touch with the churches there, and they appealed to him for advice, the new departure in public worship must have been known. In 1683 the vicar published *Songs of Praise*, and followed with other poems. There is no evidence that any of these were sung at all, still less in public worship, though they were republished; only since a Baptist re-issued the whole in 1859 have lines been extracted from different parts, and worked up into hymns which are now sung. The lines by which he is best known originally ran

I've found the Pearl of greatest Price,
My heart doth sing for Joy;
And sing I must; a Christ I have;
O what a Christ have I?

Keach had a wild young son Elias, who went to America, not indeed as a redemptioner, but certainly for England's good. He landed at Philadelphia, where there were very few ordained ministers; and thought to get an excellent start by dressing in black and donning bands. Indeed he was soon asked to preach, but in the midst of his sermon he was self-convicted of his hypocrisy, stopped, and confessed his imposture. Hear-

ing of a Baptist minister at Pennepeck, who had founded there the church of Lower Dublin, he went, convinced the church of his repentance, was baptized, and was ordained. For six years he did good work along both sides of Delaware Bay, till the restoration of religious liberty at home made him feel his place was near his father.

Before he landed in London, representatives of 101 Baptist churches had met there to plan for the future. They approved the confession edited by Collins, including the statement that public singing was part of the proper worship. Keach had vehemently pressed the matter, had been challenged to defend his views, and had accepted; but the meeting was intent on business, and checked oral debate. It established a fund for advancing the Baptist cause in many ways, and appointed several treasurers including John Leader, his son-in-law Isaac Marlow, and John Collet of Hackney. Marlow, however, was strongly opposed to singing, and published a pamphlet against it; Keach redeemed his promise, and replied in *The breach repaired in God's worship; or, Singing of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs proved to be a holy ordinance of Jesus Christ*. This included a critical examination of Marlow's brochure and its appendix. Marlow promptly responded, whereupon Keach was supported, not only by brother ministers like Knollys, Stead, and Whinnel, but by Leader and Collet. Lawrence Wise took the practical step of issuing more hymns for the Lord's supper. When the question was raised again at another general meeting, the decision was that no principle was involved, and that each church should please itself.

It was at this stage that Elias returned, with such a new reputation that he speedily gathered a church in the City, and was asked to join in preaching a course of sermons at the centre of the dissenting interest, the Pinners' Hall on Broad Street. The discussion continued in pamphlets, more supporters of hymns being Richard Allen, Joseph Maisters, William Collins, John Piggott, Thomas Harrison, and Joseph Stennett. The last of these published more hymns, one of which commended itself so that Spurgeon revived it. Another, which has been in constant use, gives a remarkable instance how people will sing without thinking, what they do not dream of practicing, when they proclaim the faith of this Seventh Day Baptist, who taught his church to sing after sunset on Friday

Another six days' work is done,
Another Sabbath is begun.

Meantime another Baptist, of a third type, had been convinced, in the country; John Reeve of Bessel's Green published some *Spiritual Hymns upon Solomon's Song*.

Despite another round of debate in 1699, the singers had established their practice. Marlow left London and settled in Leominster, where he and his family well supported the Baptist church. Did he ever ponder over the fact that by his persistence he had distracted attention, had split two fine London churches, had wrecked the whole forward movement?

Elias Keach died that October; but the practice and the covenants of his new church, with those of his father's, were destined to have great weight when the Philadelphia Association girded itself next century for its own forward movement. Keach sealed his victory in 1700 by an enlarged edition of his hymn book. By that time, a young man from Southampton, who had studied at a fine academy near to John Collet, had been writing some hymns which his church was induced to use. Three years after Keach went to sing on high, Isaac Watts followed his lead by publishing some *Hymns and Spiritual Songs*, including

Hear what the voice from heaven proclaims.

He was courteous enough to wait till Stennett's course was run before he turned back to Psalm 118, and instead of baldly translating it all, let it inspire him to Christian praise in a paraphrase entitled "Hosanna; the Lord's Day; or, Christ's Resurrection, and our Salvation"—

This is the Day the Lord hath made,
He calls the hours His own.

Watts and Stennett would agree to sink their difference as to the precise day, and early any morning to sing as Spurgeon wrote for Keach's church

Sweetly the holy hymn
Breaks on the morning air;
Before the world with smoke is dim
We meet to offer prayer.

Whitefield's Revival, and Singing

In 1739 George Whitefield came to the new colony of Georgia, founded for refugees from Salzburg. Though he was appointed as the Episcopal clergyman at Savannah, he never settled down to humdrum local duties. At the capital he adopted the idea of his friend John Wesley, derived from the work of Francke at Halle, and founded an orphanage for the refugee children. Orphanages in England were great training schools for music, Handel taking a special interest in the Foundling Hospital, till it came to think it had some proprietary rights in the *Messiah*. Germans at Savannah would welcome this form of worship.

Whitefield installed one of his English companions, Nicholas Bedge-wood, to manage the orphanage, while he in practice toured all the seaboard, when he was not in England for ordination, on lawsuits, or begging for the orphanage, which he wished to be the nucleus of a college. His diary shows that he was on good terms with Tilly from Salisbury at Savannah, with Isaac Chanler, a Bristol man, in South Carolina, with Jenkin Jones at Philadelphia, and that he knew of the German Dunkers at their Germantown, so remarkable for their music. He stirred a new spirit in the colonies. The Established Congregationalists of Connecticut, however, formally forbade the ministers to countenance him. As a result, the "New Light" churches that sprang up were left to think out their position and to find their natural friends; this always means that they become some kind of Baptist. Here is a typical story, gathered by Morgan Edwards in New Jersey. From Mansfield in Connecticut a New Light church migrated to Wantage; the members felt doubtful about infant baptism, and at last rejected it. Remembering that believers are "buried in baptism," they broke the ice in the shape of a grave; then two men baptized one another. Such was the origin of the Baptist church at Wantage, in 1756, and it was striking enough for John Leland afterwards to pen

Christians, if your hearts are warm,
Ice and snow can do no harm.

The names Mansfield and Wantage are to be borne in mind.

Eight years later, the Connecticut men had seen better light, and Whitefield preached at New Haven College; then he went on a long evangelistic tour in New York, including Salisbury. He was no longer keeping a diary, but he wrote frequent letters to Robert Keen, whom he had made trustee of the Tabernacle, and of the chapel on the road to Tottenham Court. It was a strong bond that both men were ardent singers. No one seems to have noticed a remarkable token of this. In the tunebook edited by Keen are tunes named *Whitefield*, *Tabernacle*, *Tottenham Court*, *Georgia*, *Savannah*, *Carolina*, *Charleston*, *Virginia*, *Richmond*, *Baltimore*, *Jersey*, *Wantage*, *New York*, *Salisbury*, *Mansfield*, *Stamford*, *Providence College*, *Newhaven*, *Boston*, *Newbury*. It was from this last town that Whitefield wrote his last letter, and it was to Keen. It ought to be fully recognized that the tremendous growth of colonial Baptists was due, through the Separate churches and the New Lights, to Whitefield. In this way were won Baldwin and Leland of Massachusetts, Backus and Stearns of Connecticut, Ustick and Furman of New York; and they lived to organize Baptist work all down the coast. Even at his own Savannah, his trusted helper Bedge-wood became a Baptist

and trod in his steps as an evangelist; while deliberate Baptist home missions followed from his example.

Baptist song was rejuvenated in the same way. Valentine Wightman had had to publish on the topic in 1730 before the Connecticut churches were inclined to sing at all. It was only in the very year of Whitefield's death that Gano persuaded his church to buy hymn books instead of relying on the minister to dictate two lines at a time. Leland tackled the problem differently, and single verses became popular, easily memorized for frequent use; they came to characterize revival services. Yet he wrote longer hymns also, such as, "The day is past and gone"; while Baldwin penned, "Come, happy souls, adore the Lamb."

Information about early American tunes had not trickled across to England. John Bowen of New York wrote to Rippon in 1800, saying that he had sold some of his tune books and wanted six more—in which case he had one extra thrown in—with and without clasps. His letter, published in the first volume of the *Transactions of the [English Baptist] Historical Society*, 1908, pp. 69-76, abounds in business details, and mentions that one publisher had pirated the hymn book, and had a good market among the Presbyterians; while Ustick, now in Philadelphia, was returning the compliment paid in naming a tune for him, by printing two thousand copies, which he sold at 87½ cents. The edition which Rippon would send contained new tunes named *America*, *Vermont*, *Kentucky* (it was insulting the Alleghenies by setting this to "O'er the gloomy hills of darkness"), *Stillman*, *Manning*, *Ustick*—some of them by his new musical editor, Thomas Walker. Rippon's *Baptist Register* had given much American news, and a fine engraving of the new meetinghouse at Providence, with a spire copied from one on what Londoners would soon call Trafalgar Square. The tenor bell at Providence bore a motto which alluded to the place of music now engrained in Baptist life—

For freedom of conscience this town was first planted,
Persuasion, not force, was used by the people,
This church is the oldest and has not recanted,
Enjoying and granting bell temple and steeple.

There is one curious blend of music and missions that closely concerns America, and offers a problem to be solved there. Rippon's book contains tunes *Tiverton*, *Elim*, *Stamford*, signed by Grigg. This man proves to be a student at Rippon's own academy in Bristol, founded in the very year when Whitefield sang his swansong. The first of these tunes was evidently named by Rippon after his own birthplace, Tiverton; it is so good that it is still in use; the second is named, like many

others, from the Bible; the third bears the name of another town. Grigg was a lad from Launceston, and had no sort of connection with Lincolnshire. The more famous Stamford is in Connecticut.

Jacob Grigg was the third missionary of the English Baptist Missionary Society. Sierra Leone was headquarters of the slave trade, and a bold stroke at their lair was made by the British in 1792. A church of freed negro slaves from America had taken refuge in Novia Scotia, whose climate did not suit; and it was decided to repatriate them to the very district whence many had been taken and sold. A Freetown was planted at the mouth of the exact gulf whence the slave ships started; and a military force was sent, whose commander was to govern the whole little colony. Jacob Grigg and a fellow student were ordained and sent out; they were soon on excellent terms with the negro Baptist church under David George. But the situation was extremely complex, for there was war with the French Republic, whose vessels attacked the little colony; the slavers undersold the negro Baptists who were trying to establish honest trade; and Grigg discovered that some of the very officials sent out to stop the slave trade were at least conniving at it. It was hard for a student just out of college, and his expostulations so incensed the governor that about April, 1797, he was summarily put aboard the next vessel for America, and so vanished from English ken. Ships for America from the headquarters of the slave trade were probably freighted with kidnapped negroes. Was Grigg fiery enough to become a nuisance, so that he was knocked on the head and thrown overboard? did he land with a full knowledge of the Middle Passage, but find himself in such a state as Georgia, where even Whitefield had been given slaves, and bought more, apparently regarding them as a natural domestic institution? He does not seem to have had any introduction from Zachary Macaulay in Freetown to the Baptist church under George Liele in Jamaica. Did he subside? did he do any kind of work in any part of the United States? Can any American trace him, say at Stamford?

THE CALL OF THE PROPHET AMOS

ROLLAND EMERSON WOLFE

Tufts College

IN MODERN times three successive types of Bible study have been in evidence. First, there were the traditional dogmatic canons of interpretation which were inherited from mediæval and ancient times. This approach dominated the field until the latter years of the nineteenth century. Then followed a period, lasting approximately seventy-five years, which terminated in the decade just ended. During this time the movement known as "higher criticism," with the dry analysis too often characteristic of it, was at the height of its development. Today, however, a new era of Bible study is in the making, as we are entering upon a third stage in which the primary aim is appreciative, *i.e.*, to achieve greater appreciation for the Bible.

This does not mean that the results of critical scholarship, which of course will continue its advance, are to be disregarded. Quite the contrary, these results will be used more effectively than in the past. Critical scholarship has failed to reap the full fruitage of its labors and make them available to the masses of people who are yearning not so much for isolated detailed facts as for new light on a difficult book. Biblical scholarship has been deficient when it comes to popularization, which is needed more in this field than in most others. Abstract scholarship, which scarcely has penetrated beyond academic circles, has been strong in analysis but weak in comprehension. Today there is need of a more pictorial presentation which the mass of the people will be able to grasp. Imagination, if in harmony with known facts and if used wisely, may be of untold value in illuminating the pages of this ancient book so as to make it live for the people of today. The challenge to biblical scholarship at the present time is to replace its prosaicness with imaginative comprehension.

Let us take the calls of the prophets for instance. Specific facts are given only in the writings of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. Yet other prophets probably had calls equally significant. Because of the absence of literally expressed factual statements, scholarship up to the present moment has been able to say little or nothing about the calls of Amos, Hosea, Micah, etc. However, by using the imaginative approach, the calls of many of these can be portrayed with vividness. In observing the trends of their ministries one must assume certain unstated facts which the expressed items necessitate by implication. Then, by going on to treat this sum of factual information pictorially and imaginatively,

one gains appreciation for the motives with which these prophets approached their work. We observe the particular incentive which impelled and sent them forth as thundering voices for righteousness to the people of their day. By coming to comprehend the naturalness of their calls, the prophets become more of an inspiration to people of the present time.

The prophet Amos provides a good example. Commentators have given little more than the stated biblical facts that he was a shepherd of Tekoa, with an avocation of tending sycamore trees, and that Yahweh took him from following the flock and told him to prophesy to Israel. This is, however, but a bare outline. Just how did Yahweh take him from following the flock? Details must be filled in from implications in the various oracles and from observing how the prophet's mentality and purpose unfold.

The element of geography plays a large role in understanding Amos. But of perhaps greatest significance is the hitherto unnoticed observation that a lion motif is prominent in his oracles (1:2; 3:4, 8, 12; 5:19). May this motif have had something to do with the call of Amos? The relationship between the call and the lion's roar is clearly stated in 3:8 where it suggests that the roar of a lion was the agency of the prophetic call of Amos. Christian interpreters have become such good allegorists that no commentator has thought to interpret this literally. Yet the incident of the lion is probably the key which unlocks the secrets of the call of Amos. Combining this with the other facts and factors hitherto referred to, we get an interesting picture.

To find the home of this young man who is to exert such great influence on the future destinies of Israel, we depart from Jerusalem, journeying to the southward. At Bethlehem we leave the travelled highway and, turning to the southeast, begin to mount the foothills of the Jeshimon Mountains. After ascending for five or six miles through regions of ever greater barrenness, we finally arrive at a fastness among the hills where a small number of shepherds have constructed their dwellings. The name of this place is Tekoa. To this group of mountaineers comes the high prerogative of giving to the world an illustrious son, the pioneer who is to start the line of great Hebrew prophets.

A more unpromising location would be difficult to find. The hills surrounding the settlement are scarcely more than desolate wastes, with very little water or vegetation. Only this group of hardy shepherds have dared to brave these hills. For fifteen miles to the north, fifteen miles to the east, and twenty-five miles to the south not another settlement is to be found. In this outpost of civilization man must wage constant war with the desert.

Amos had grown up as an unschooled youth in a humble home, or simple tent, devoid of luxury and privilege. Instead of attending school, his early years had been spent for the most part as a shepherd boy in the wilds of this eastern Judean range, overlooking the wastes of the Dead Sea. The hardness of the life in these hills, the vigor of the stock from which he came, and the solitude which nature has so richly provided in these parts combined, as they so often do, to develop one of their number beyond his fellows and to lead him forth from the obscurity of this place.

Had Amos ever travelled from this isolated mountain region? It is probable he was made to guard the flocks while his elders made the trips to market to sell their wool. Perhaps he may have been fortunate enough to have visited Bethlehem and possibly Jerusalem on one of these annual occasions. It is safe to assume that most of his knowledge of the outside world was gained by questioning others of his clan who had been to the cities and villages, or perchance travellers who had wandered into these deserted regions. These reports from the outer world had made a great impression upon Amos. He was troubled by the rumors concerning the degenerate manner of life which prevailed in the cities of Judah. He was even more distressed by reports from travellers to the north country concerning the far greater corruption which prevailed in Israel. Knowledge of these conditions weighed on the mind of Amos, troubling this sensitive youth.

As pasturage in those arid regions was sparse, it was necessary to journey far from Tekoa, to the remote mountain slopes, to find adequate grazing lands. Nights were spent wherever the flock happened to be feeding, for it was impossible to bring back the sheep to Tekoa each evening. Because of constant danger from wild beasts, the repose of Amos may have been none too restful. Of the many experiences on those solitary nights, he recorded but a single event, one which made a tremendous impression upon him and marked the turning point in his life.

As usual, he has brought his sheep into a natural shelter among the rocks. He lies down and looks upward to the friendly Palestinian stars. When about to fall asleep, the silence of nighttime is broken by the bloodcurdling roar of a lion, pouncing on some near-by prey. We can imagine the thumping heart and almost paralyzing fear of Amos as he faces the danger, expecting this beast to advance in his direction and attack the flock.

It becomes apparent, as those tense moments drag on, that the lion has gone in some other direction. With a sigh of relief, the shepherd again settles down to rest. But he cannot sleep. His mind is absorbed

with thoughts of the lion's roar and the way in which some unsuspecting prey was torn and devoured.

After some time, Amos comes to see larger meaning in the incident. A significant simile enters his mind. The howling of the lion suggests the deity's fierce rage over the wickedness of his people. Yahweh, god of the Hebrews, is ready to pounce upon the sinful nation.

How can Amos continue with shepherd duties when Israel, the unsuspecting prey, is in imminent danger? He cannot remain with his flock. It is necessary that the people of Israel be warned of threatening catastrophe. Since he alone knows of it, he is the one for the task.

To desert his flock and go as a prophet to Israel was the inevitable consequence of his experience on that night. This was just as inescapable as the fear which seizes one who hears the roar of a lion. Amos had not chosen to become a prophet. This career had been forced upon him. A divine compulsion had taken possession of him. It was a case of life or death for the nation, and who, having discerned this, could keep silent? Though he lay down to sleep that evening an ordinary shepherd, those tense moments had transformed him into a prophet of the Most High.

On the following days, Amos plans as to the type of public activity he may carry on most effectively. While watching his flocks, he reviews the moral delinquencies of Israel. He also formulates provisionally what he thinks ought to be said concerning them. In accordance with the custom of public speakers of his time, Amos fits these statements into a poetic mold. Then he rehearses them from day to day until they assume polished literary form. These memory couplets, which he makes no attempt to write down, become the basis of the addresses which he will deliver later.

Perhaps Amos learns that the Assyrian armies are merely waiting for an opportune chance to attack. Feeling that now his preparation is sufficiently complete, he decides it is time to leave the seclusion of his home and embark upon a public ministry. With the courage of young manhood, he hopes to be instrumental in turning a nation from her degenerate ways so as to save her from attack and annihilation.

When Amos finally returns home with his flocks and informs parents and friends of his new resolve, he meets his first disillusionment. We may imagine they are frank to tell him that his ideas are absurd, that only the mind of a fool could conceive such folly. They tell him his job is to tend sheep, not to direct the destinies of the Israelite nation. It would be impudent for him to intrude himself into the internal affairs of a foreign people. They tell him this mission, which he has just outlined to them, can result only in failure. Furthermore, he will disgrace

his family and bring disrepute upon the people of Tekoa and their honorable village.

The opposition of family and friends is hardest for Amos to bear. He tries to convince them that he knows what he is about to do, that he is able for the task, and that he is confident of achieving results. They are not impressed by his remarks. Finally, on a certain occasion Amos makes a desperate attempt to convince his family of the urgency of his proposed mission.

Unfortunately, this young prophet is handicapped by inadequate words with which to describe the experience on that decisive night of his life. He lives in a day when there are as yet no psychological terms by which mental states and feelings can be expressed. His only possibility lies in using figures of speech, inadequate though they may be in attempting to portray such a profound inner experience. He presents a series of nine parallel parables, hoping that by repetition his hearers may get some appreciation of the happenings on that momentous night. The couplets state, in variant terms, the single thought that when a certain cause has acted, the corresponding result is inevitable. He concludes by showing the application of this succession of figures to the central aim of describing his call to the prophetic office:

Do two people travel together,
 Unless they have met?
 Does a lion roar in the forest,
 Unless he has found prey?
 Does a young whelp utter his growl,
 Unless he has seized something?
 Does a bird fall to the earth,
 Unless a net has been set for it?
 Does a trap spring from the ground,
 Unless something has tripped it?
 Can a trumpet be blown in the city,
 And the people not become terrified?
 Can there be disaster in a village,
 And Yahweh has not caused it?

.

The lion has roared,
 Who will not fear?
 Yahweh has spoken,
 Who can but prophesy?¹

Whatever the final attitude of his parents, Amos is not to be dissuaded from the task he feels compelled to perform. On a certain day we see this unsophisticated shepherd leave Tekoa and make his way

¹ Amos 3: 3-6, 8.

toward the north country. He passes through Jerusalem and the cities of Judah, for he has resolved to destroy the beast in its very den. His face is set toward Samaria, capital of the northern kingdom and the chief seat of iniquity. As he walks along, he rehearses the words he will say, correlating them with observations made in the villages and cities through which he has passed. Eager to cast his influence for righteousness, he moves on with resolute step.

Amos does not anticipate the opposition awaiting him in the cities of Israel. He goes forth with only one impelling motive, a consuming passion for righteousness. Little does he realize also, as he wends his way northward, that he is to be the pioneer of a unique form of literary expression adapted to the prophetic spirit, the founder of a line of prophets destined to transform the primitive non-ethical Hebrew religion into Judaism with its exalted moral and religious principles. Though he is to give the world a new spirit, he knows nothing of the remarkable significance his words and acts are to assume. He appears in Israel simply as an earnest youth, eager to enthrone righteousness and shatter the evil forces of his day. With a soul fired by the spirit of God, and impelled to action by the vision of a just society, he goes forth to hold high the torch of prophecy.

PROFESSOR BRIGHTMAN'S "CHRISTIAN ESSENTIALS"

M. C. OTTO

University of Wisconsin

I

IN HIS interesting article, "The Essence of Christianity," published in the April (1941) number of the *CROZER QUARTERLY*, Edgar Sheffield Brightman does me the honor of including my name among those whom he regards as Christians. In fact he declares that if he had to choose between Eduard von Hartmann's Christianity and mine, he would choose mine. Quoting Eduard von Hartmann as insisting that Christ called on men to despise the world and to live in the faith and hope of a hereafter, that "this is the historical and only important content of the doctrine preached by Jesus," and contrasting this doctrine with the cosmic atheism and militant concern for the highest human values realizable on earth through human effort—the position I tried to set forth in the book, *The Human Enterprise*—Mr. Brightman asks: "As between these two extremes, which is the more truly Christian?" And he answers: "I for one do not hesitate to say that Max Otto's position comes far closer to the essential spirit of a follower of Jesus than does Eduard von Hartmann's."

This declaration, I must confess, startled me. Nor should it go unchallenged, in spite of the good intention and the evident sincerity with which it was made. Far from wishing to offend any one, I must nevertheless say frankly that to represent "an atheistic humanist" (the phrase is Mr. Brightman's) as a Christian, is to court the kind of intellectual and moral confusion which is by all means to be avoided, more especially at a time of religious crisis, such as the present. It is true that "there is no intrinsic merit in disagreement," and that "the practical values of agreement for human welfare . . . are obvious," but nothing is gained by an agreement which simply ignores the differences that need to be singled out and dealt with.

II

The misinterpretation of a particular person's position is, in this instance, of relatively minor importance. The significant question is whether the technique employed in the article as a whole is open to the same objection as that exemplified in this particular case. As to that question we shall be better able to make up our minds after we have examined the discussion point by point.¹

¹ Page references are omitted in the conviction that "The Essence of Christianity" should be read or re-read in its entirety.

Mr. Brightman cannot be accused of being unaware of the difficulty of his undertaking. This is clearly shown by such paragraphs as this:

Before any assured answer can be given to the question which we have raised, it is necessary to consider the problem of the criterion of Christianity. How are we to test what is and what is not Christian?

Moreover, I am impressed by Mr. Brightman's intention to regard Christianity as a living process that cannot "be adequately defined by exclusive reference to its beginnings or to any one stage of its development." Thus he says:

Since Christianity is not a mathematical object, it cannot be adequately defined by an arbitrary set of postulates. Christianity, if it is anything, is an historical religion. Hence it must be defined as living historical movements are defined, not like pure abstract concepts of logic or mathematics.

The same idea is expressed picturesquely in this way: "Christianity is not an acorn; it is a growing oak." And again: "To be a Christian is not, primarily, to accept certain ideas, however true they may be; but, rather, it is to stand in actual relations to the life-stream of Christian history, a stream that flows from Jesus down to the present."

But these are figures of speech. If they are to help us to understand what the "essence" of Christianity is, they must be translated into terms of concrete actuality. The words "a growing oak," and "a stream that flows," are in themselves concrete enough. So concrete indeed that the reader may fail to notice that "a growing Christianity" and a "life-stream of Christian history" are not concrete things like oaks and rivers. In other words, the concrete reference of the figure of speech may carry over to the abstract idea and give the reader the false impression that the abstract idea also refers to something concrete. This captivating fallacy deserves a name, if it does not already have one.

III

Perhaps the most tantalizing portion of Mr. Brightman's article is the following:

Yet who would care to deny the name of Christian to anyone who seeks to follow Jesus, regardless of divergences in interpretation? Does not anyone move in the Christian life-stream of history, if he finds somewhere in the Christian Scriptures, especially in the records about Jesus, a source of supreme moral and religious inspiration?

This short paragraph strikes me as being such a nest of ambiguities that the whole issue might be made to turn upon its interpretation. Is there no choice as to what is more, and what less, essential in one's view

of who the Jesus was that is to be followed, or what he himself stood for? And take the words "supreme moral and religious inspiration": each one of these words, excepting the word "and," needs to be defined, and the tenability of the argument depends upon what definition is selected. Mr. Brightman, himself, a little later, asks this pertinent question: "If we follow Jesus, do we follow we know not what?" And he goes on to say: "The Church has preferred an uncertain tradition to a relatively certain one, because the certain one would be awkward to administer." He is referring to the "supposed teaching of Jesus on divorce, despite the conflicting textual traditions," but the problem is a general one. Why not change "somewhere in the Christian Scriptures" to read "*anything found anywhere* in the Christian Scriptures"? Or would that only shift the problem to what scriptures are Christian?

At any rate, Mr. Brightman seems to me to be talking good sense if, as I take it, he is speaking for himself in these observations: "If following Jesus does not mean something specific, it is a meaningless phrase." "No one can reasonably deny that following Jesus is impossible without ideas. If no definition of 'following Jesus' is available, no identification of Christians is available. There has been no religion, certainly no Christian religion, without a theology." The summary offered by him of the troubles encountered by one who means to discover exactly what Jesus taught is a remarkable condensation of complicated facts, which only a person versed in the literature and history of Christianity could have achieved. The section on this material concludes with this statement: "These points of conflict are sufficiently contentious to make clear the difficulty of our task." But having once said it, he promptly forgets it.

Some of us might feel baffled in the face of the numerous "dialectical opposites" which cannot be avoided in this connection. Not so Mr. Brightman. He thinks T. S. Eliot "not wholly wrong" in identifying Christianity with dogma. Father James B. Gallagher's insistence upon "a whole-hearted acceptance of a divinely instituted church, teaching with infallible authority the doctrine of the one infallible Christ," appears to him only an exaggeration. "When the thesis," he suggests, "is thus carried to the extreme of Roman Catholic authoritarianism, it turns, for liberal minds, into the antithesis: Following Jesus unitedly is impossible if we insist on agreement in ideas." Hence this solution:

If we tarry in the thesis, as Catholics or as Calvinists, we have authoritarianism. If we tarry in the antithesis, we have anarchy. If we move to a synthesis, we have Christian freedom, which is a genuine bond of unity. Christian freedom is the liberty of followers of Jesus combined with faith. The principle of this synthesis is that of following Jesus, yet freely interpreting his message, his doctrine,

and his relevance to life, in loyalty to our best insights, whether they be Catholic or Protestant, theistic or humanistic. Jesus is then not a fixed model, but seed and soil and sun.

Now all I get out of this is that we are to change the search for *essence* to the search for a *synthesis*. Synthesis means we are to have faith "that we are moving toward a goal that Jesus sought, even when our ideas contradict the ideas of many other Christians." In view of what has been said of the difficulty of deciding what it was that Jesus requires of his followers, something more would seem to be called for than the incommunicative metaphor, "seed and soil and sun." Do we get it? Possibly some reader can find it in this paragraph; I did not:

The inexhaustibility of the spiritual life is better conveyed by a New Testament that contains a Paul and a James, and an American church that contains a Wieman and a Hocking that it would be by the rigid uniformity of Father Gallagher's thesis or by the individualistic anarchy of the antithesis.

IV

It is gratifying that Mr. Brightman did not limit his article to general considerations, but that in an important section of it he set down certain specific essentials. The section bears this title: *Are There Any Ideas on Which Almost All Christians May Agree at All Stages of the Historical Dialectic?* I propose to consider a number of the particulars he mentions, summarizing what he says and adding a few words of comment.

1. The one essential of a Christian is the desire to follow Jesus. "Following Jesus does not mean believing everything that he taught or imitating his behavior. It means rather finding some of life's essential, saving values in or through him."

How can we find "essential, saving values through him" while we remain in the dark as regards *him*? And that is where we do remain for all the light we have gained from the discussion preceding this section. We cannot "follow Jesus" without knowing at least that it is he whom we follow.

2. A Christian must believe that man "is a creature, dependent on a power unspeakably greater than he." Man's aspiration to goodness would not have arisen or have survived, "if the Greater Power were not a healing power which took the initiative in seeking his well-being No humanistic emphasis on naturalistic processes in spiritual growth can obscure the truth that man does not live in a vacuum, but is dependent for his spiritual welfare on adjustment to objective forces which sustain him in his search for values"

Are there not various interpretations of this divine initiative? Since

there are, we might as well allow the ambiguity to remain with the word "Christian," instead of transferring it to a new phrase. Besides, can a Greater Power "take the initiative" unless it is a *personal* Power? And granting the inevitability of man's adjustment to objective forces if he is to realize values, does this prove the objective forces to be a personal Power? It does not. Hence the unavoidable sense of dependence is not necessarily of the theistic Christian type.

3. Humility is declared to be "a virtue characteristically Christian." Unless this "Christian humility" is taken in a loose sense it cannot be ascribed to Christians of all persuasions. On the other hand, there are non-Christian forms of quite genuine humility.

4. The Christian must not see suffering as wholly evil or hopelessly bad, and rebelliously demand a life of pure pleasure. Christianity must be regarded as "essentially a religion of redemption through sacrifice and suffering, however the theological interpretations of this redemption may differ from each other and however revolting the hymnology of 'a fountain filled with blood' may be to refined sensibilities."

Again, unless this redemptive quality of suffering and evil is taken with considerable latitude, it is not characteristic of all types of Christianity, and unless it is given a Christian interpretation, it is not peculiar to Christianity. All men know that certain ills of life can be turned to good, and that unavoidable evil should be made to do this service so far as that is possible. And very few people who are thoughtful about life, whatever their attitude towards religion, "demand a life of pure pleasure."

The "Problem of Evil" has been a standing difficulty to all interpretations of the world which rest upon "divine initiative." The treatment it gets in this article is the usual one of walking around it.

5. Another Christian "essential" is self-respect. "Jesus taught that, as every sheep is precious to the good shepherd, so every soul is precious to God. In this preciousness of the individual to God he founded the preciousness of the individual to himself." Without this qualification of Christian humility, "humility ceases to be humble, and becomes . . . the loathsome 'I am so 'umble' of Uriah Heep . . . Christian self-respect requires the utmost endeavor of all the powers of the soul."

Obviously, when Mr. Brightman has reached this division of his article, if not before, he has forgotten his intention of extracting the "essence" common to all who "follow Jesus," and is thinking rather of a type of Christian who believes in a personal God, in the immortality of the soul, and in the obligation to "lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven" as devotion to "the highest values." And we must remember not only this, but that self-respect has meant and may still mean something

utterly different from this "self-respect of the soul." Innumerable people who lived in the past, and who stressed the value of self-respect in theory and in practice, would not have understood at all what this *spiritual* self-respect refers to; and that is true as well today.

In a word, this search for the Christian essence appears to succeed by so defining its task that success is won before the seeking is started. The ostensible process of demonstration is really a begging of the question.

The section we are considering lists ten such "essentials." We have taken a look at the first five and will forego the temptation to discuss the rest. The second five—Respect for all persons, Love for all persons, Coöperation with man and God, The reality of change, and Hope—are, so far as I am concerned, open to the same criticism as the first five. If the criticism of these is in principle sound, as I think it is, the chances are that it would hold of those omitted; and if my line of criticism was not well taken, which is of course a possibility, nothing would be accomplished by carrying it further.

V

Shall we conclude, then, that Mr. Brightman's article is worthless? Not at all. It has important value for at least two reasons, even assuming that he has failed to set forth, as he intended, "The Essence of Christianity." In the first place, it is a clear exemplification of faith in the highest ideals of life. Possibly there have been times in human history when practical evidence of this faith was more needed than today, but I do not happen to know of any. In the second place, it is a sincere attempt to persuade all who join him in that faith to forget unessential differences, of whatever sort they may be, and to unite their efforts in the task of realizing the significant ideals to which they are devoted in common. Mr. Brightman recognizes that this is not an easy thing to accomplish. "Ultimate presuppositions differ so radically," he admits, "that the very concept of one true Christianity seems almost to be an absurdity." Yet the necessity for such coöperation evidently seemed to him so crucial that no obstacle should be allowed to stand in its way. Every thoughtful person will appreciate the desirability of having this necessity impressed upon contemporary idealists.

Are there nevertheless reasons why this article falls short of what requires to be said, to say nothing of what requires to be done? I think there are, and I shall end with a few words touching one of them. I have in mind the outstanding problem, relevant to this discussion, of present-day aspiring youth, so far as my experience as teacher has enabled me to understand the situation in which they find themselves.

Young men and young women who desire to contribute toward the improvement of the lot of mankind, who feel obliged to consult the knowledge they have acquired in the course of their education, and who are, moreover, aware of what is going on about them overseas and in their own country—these young men and women, if they are intelligent and honest, must wonder and do wonder, whether there are any moral or religious ideals or principles to which an informed and reflective person can confidently subscribe. Those of whom I am speaking (they are the majority, I believe) earnestly desire to discover such ideals or principles, but are often doubtful that they can be found. Stating their predicament in familiar language, a predicament which they show both in what they say and in what they do, it is: "Lord I believe; help thou mine unbelief."

It is this crucial situation which Mr. Brightman's article does nothing to relieve. In fact, if those who seek direction toward dependable ideals read the article, and are influenced by the reading, matters will be made worse, rather than better. What we need at this hour, whether we are young or old, but especially if we are young, is the clearest possible formulation of concrete ends of endeavor, ends in the pursuit of which we may hope to enhance the general satisfactoriness, and to elevate the general moral quality, of human living. Mr. Brightman can take pride in a definition of Christianity which "includes Oxford groupers and Barthians, Christian Scientists and Roman Catholics, theists and atheistic humanists," for that is an achievement. It is, however, a purely intellectual achievement, or even a purely verbal achievement; in any case an achievement which seems praiseworthy only so long as vagueness of meaning causes no feeling of disturbance, and no need is felt of translating the definition into terms of distinctive practice.

There is a far better alternative, I believe. It sticks closer to the realities, yet still keeps in view the highest ideals of life and the advantage of coöperation in their furtherance. Let the adherents of each religion, each economic or political group, each educational, moral, or æsthetic philosophy be encouraged to do their best to envisage and appreciate the unique values espoused by them; let them be encouraged likewise to take in, with sympathetic imagination, the unique values for which opponents contend; and let all of us encourage one another to help originate and perfect instruments of creative bargaining as the means of adjudicating conflicting values, and thus arrive at dependable, agreed-upon next steps in social progress—let these things be undertaken, and a number of highly desirable results will accrue. The power of both rigid dogmatism and delusive vagueness will be weakened, while we shall retain the enrichment of experience flowing from differences of aspiration

and insight. At the same time we shall make the democratic way of life more and more workable and meaningful. And all the time every man, woman, and child will have specific, clean-cut social ends to work for, and will be forming those habits of mind and heart which are the factors of spiritual development.

From Off the Campus and On

IN TIMES like these of noise and unrest the article from the pen of William Wistar Comfort will be read and reread. Its quiet word of counsel and of warning made it a notable commencement address for men who were bound to find themselves tempted to forget that the still small voice is even yet to be heard by those who will listen. For many years Dr. Comfort was president of Haverford College and a full-time professor of French.

Professor Bixler needs no introduction to readers of the *QUARTERLY*. They will learn with pleasure that he has been elected president of Colby College, and will begin his service in Maine in June, 1942. At present he is Bussey Professor of Divinity in the Harvard Divinity School. In addition to his article, "Notes on the Problem of Suffering," which was read before the American Theological Society last spring, he has contributed to the present issue a review of Professor Pratt's provocative book, *Can We Keep the Faith?*

Ovid R. Sellers is professor of Old Testament in Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago. He has participated in several excavations in Palestine and was director of the expedition at Beth-Zur in 1931. For several years he was secretary of the Middle West Branch of the American Oriental Society; at present he is a trustee of the American Schools of Oriental Research.

Dr. Clarke's own crisp words will introduce him to our readers: "Edwin L. Clarke has been professor of sociology at Rollins College since 1930. He is the author of *The Art of Straight Thinking*. That should be more than enough." Even a casual reading of his article, "One Holy Church," should reveal that he knows not alone the art of straight thinking but also the even more difficult one, straight talking.

"A Fresh View of the Introduction to Paul's Letters" should prove of interest to all our readers. Those who are tempted to feel that New Testament scholarship is content to thresh over old straw will discover that Mr. Riddle has pitchforked in a fresh new bundle. For many years he has been a member of the department of New Testament in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, and is the author of several books in the field of early Christianity.

It is with especial pleasure that we welcome to our pages an eminent English Baptist, Dr. W. T. Whitley. He is vice-president of the (English) Baptist Historical Society and an indefatigable investigator of early Baptist history. As he mentions in his opening paragraph, it is a par-

ticularly timely article since 1941 is a double milestone in the history of Baptist hymnody.

Rolland Emerson Wolfe has been assistant professor of Old Testament literature at Tufts College since 1935. A native of Ohio, he took his degree in arts at Manchester College and his first two theological degrees at Oberlin. He received the degree of doctor of philosophy from Harvard in 1933. In addition to his teaching he has been pastor of two churches—for two years at Elyria, Ohio; for ten years at Boxford, Massachusetts. His work upon the "lesser prophets" has aroused wide interest among Old Testament scholars.

In the April issue it was remarked of Professor Brightman's article, "The Essence of Christianity": "Readers of the CROZER QUARTERLY will probably find it as provoking as did the members of the American Theological Society last April." This day has that scripture been fulfilled in our ears. Max C. Otto, chairman of the department of philosophy in the University of Wisconsin, finds himself far from content. It should prove of distinct value to read the articles side by side. Each author is an eminent philosopher and influential teacher. Professor Otto is the author of several books and is now an associate editor of the *Humanist*. He was born in Germany, coming to this country at the age of five. He has studied at Wisconsin, Chicago, and Heidelberg.

We welcome five reviewers "from off the campus" in this issue. Professor Bixler has already been introduced in an earlier paragraph. Mr. Keighton, of Narberth, is a regular member of the reviewing staff. Walter Marshall Horton, of Oberlin, is a name too well-known to theological readers to require introduction. John Chilton Scammell is professor of English in the College of Business Administration in Boston University. He is an enthusiastic and able broadcaster on the staff of Station WRUL in Boston. At present he is at work upon a volume dealing with the difficulties and opportunities which broadcasting offers. The editor, having read considerable of the manuscript, is even now attempting to wangle an article from him on this theme for a forthcoming issue. Edgar Sheffield Brightman of Boston University is too well-known to readers of the CROZER QUARTERLY to require formal introduction.

BOOK REVIEWS

The New Testament in Basic English, translated by S. H. Hooke and others, New York, Dutton, 1941, pp. vi, 548, \$1.50 (\$2.00, \$3.00).

For years the Orthological Institute of Cambridge, England, under the direction of C. K. Ogden, has been developing a simplified form of English, called *Basic*. In theory, a very condensed vocabulary of 850 words (with a few rules for connecting combinations, as *coal-mine* from *coal* and *mine*, *designer* from *design*) suffice to express the sense of anything which can be said in English. It is thus thought to be the most efficient way to teach foreigners English, if not the basis of an international language far superior to those previously sponsored.

Under the direction of Professor Hooke of the University of London a group of biblical scholars has produced this translation of the New Testament, with the promise of a companion volume of the Old Testament in the not too-distant future. They have not aimed to replace the more familiar versions; they feel, however, that it will serve as an "introduction or supplement" to the Bible and will prove of value thus not only to those to whom English is not a native tongue but also to the general reader who finds himself lulled by familiar cadences.

The test of any translation of the New Testament is, of course, not to be made by casual sampling or even by extended reading, but only by constant use. Apparently this translation is not a mere simplification of earlier English versions, but a fresh translation of a critically edited text. And yet not infrequently it is so like the familiar versions that one is surprised that with so limited a vocabulary so much can be said. Occasionally while the English is "clear" it substitutes one notion for another or fails to carry over the sense. Thus for *mote* and *beam* we have *grain of dust* and *bit of wood*. But does not *bit of wood* lose the intentionally grotesque contrast? *Heart's desire* is for *righteousness* is necessary since hunger and thirst are apparently not considered basic. The insistence on *good news* for *gospel* makes Gal. 1:6-9 a bit startling. I had never been quite sure what the harassed sailors did (Acts 27:40), but I do not find myself much the wiser when I read *freeing the cords of the driving blades*. It is pleasant to have only sixteen verbs to bother with, but *give the sign* (for *knock*), *take food* (for *eat*), *come to the end* (for *die*) are a high price to pay. Nor is it to be neglected that a good many pretty idiomatic phrases are introduced which, I should think, would prove confusing to elementary students of English without some very definite warnings.

Nor is the vocabulary of 850 words adequate. In addition a list of fifty words is marked "Bible," one hundred more "Verse." Even these do not quite suffice. A dozen or more intruders are italicized as *camel*, *figs*, *thistles*, *sparrows*, *mustard*, *Phylacteries*, *goddess*, *emerald*, *barley*, *bear*, *scorpion*. Others are simply capitalized: Synagogue, Temple, Apostle, Gentile. At times others occur which, so far as I can see, are just not in the lists: *olive*, *worse*, *penny*, *pound*, *farthing*, and all the numbers. Perhaps such a word as *off-spring* is thought self-evident, since *off* is given in the list marked "Operations" and *spring* among the "200 Pictured." It would appear to me, however, that it might prove a bit perplexing to the novice to figure out the meaning of the compound.

That great care and skill have been exercised in the list of the 850 words is undeniable. On the other hand, some of the words included in the two supplementary lists marked "Bible" and "Verse" are so common that it would seem a dis-

tinct hardship to get along without them in any writing. For example, *husband*, *wife*, *master*, *sin*, *neighbor*, and *world* are necessary only to read the Bible; *child*, *God*, *life*, *lord*, *evening* (but not *morning*!) *prayer*, *virtue*, and *wealth* may be dispensed with save in poetry. *Town* is basic, *city* is not. Thus the "bodies of a number of sleeping saints came to life" and "went into the holy town."

The translation is dignified and far from being "pigeon English." Occasionally, apparently for no sufficient reason, the order of parallel clauses is altered (e.g., I Cor. 13:7), but on the whole the Greek is as faithfully rendered as the limited vocabulary allows. Undoubtedly many will find that the use of different words and the translation of ideas as well as of words cause them to pay new attention to pages too frequently scanned by the eye but not by the mind.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

Can We Keep the Faith? by James Bissett Pratt, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1941, pp. vi, 218, \$2.75.

When an author has written as searchingly on the problems of philosophy and with as much scholarly detail on the problems of history as has Professor Pratt, he has surely earned the right to sit down in an easy chair before the fire and discourse as informally as he does in this volume. Too many of our pleasantly discursive essayists have tried—as was said of one of them—to become mellow before they are ripe. But Professor Pratt speaks from a background of mature wisdom, and the conversational tone he uses does not fool the attentive reader into thinking that his remarks are inconsequential. There is sound philosophy in this book made more palatable by its personal and intimate mode of expression.

Professor Pratt is a liberal, "unabashed, confessed, brazen." He even retains "a little of the old and wicked belief in a certain amount of human progress." He thinks that the faith can be kept if we are really intent on keeping it and he points to the loss in radiance, moral power, and hope which will follow if we allow it to lapse. Throughout the book the reader who is acquainted with the rest of Professor Pratt's work finds allusions to themes he has treated in detail elsewhere. Much is made, for example, of the fact of selfhood and freedom, of the "dualism of process" or belief in the interaction of mind and body, of the empirical naturalism which would examine all the facts but would not explain them all in terms of physical causation, of the testimony of religious and specifically mystical experience. The book shows also the author's well-known admiration for Buddhism and for a re-vitalized Hinduism, although it is Christianity that he has in mind when he talks about keeping the faith.

At one place Professor Pratt gets up from the easy chair, takes a few philosophical arguments from the shelves, turns them into instruments of intellectual combat and lays about him with devastating effectiveness. This is the place where he attacks the "New Supernaturalism." Barth and Brunner will feel the force of these blows, for Professor Pratt is no mean antagonist. He ridicules the idea of God as the "Wholly Other" with its skeptical implications and shows ingeniously that what presents itself here is only our old friend, the "egocentric predicament," in a new form. To say with Brunner that God cannot be known because he is Subject is to say that no subjects and therefore no human selves can be known. Again, why talk so much of the Christian experience as an experience of decision if the Christian doesn't actively decide anything but is simply a passive auditor? Why insist that Christ is both person and message if the message can't be known through the person and his teachings? The New

Supernaturalism boils down to the teaching that Christ the Word, about whom we can know practically nothing, was the incomprehensible Wholly Other. Kraemer may appropriately insist, remarks Professor Pratt, that "revelation remains inaccessible even when it is revealed." God's secret, he adds, is one that has been well kept.

Professor Pratt believes that the truths of Christianity are bound to live because they are true. Organized Christianity, on the other hand, may fail, but again it may be renewed by the very suffering that today it is called on to undergo. The book points to the beauty and majesty of the Christian faith, its essential reasonableness, and emphasizes our opportunity to pass it on purged of its weakness and superstition. It is a book to read with interest, to mark with care, and to pass on to one's students with expectancy.

J. S. BIXLER

Christian Faith in History, by Hugh Miller, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. xvii, 236, \$2.50.

Dr. Hugh Miller, professor of philosophy in the University of California at Los Angeles, is another young American intellectual who has decided to take Christianity seriously. Believing that "religion is the only human impulse that goes out to all men irrespective of persons, of class barriers, of national boundaries, of racial differences"—outranking science, philosophy, and art—he holds that history, "properly and empirically written," "will establish the truth and importance of religion." The purpose of *Christian Truth in History* is to show the place of religion in social development—specifically, the place of Christianity.

After a fiery section on the "new faiths"—overharsh toward Germany in general and Hegel in particular—Miller sketches his views on faith, intellect, science, and truth. He then carries out the main purpose of his book, describing the influence of Christianity since the first century. These chapters should be required reading for every cynical modern. They are brilliant, concrete, and challenging. The book closes with a more speculative discussion of the human and the divine (rejecting humanism), the concept of nature, and the future of religion.

The author would have been wiser to have made one book out of the central chapters and another out of the less convincing philosophical framework. Nevertheless, every chapter is vigorously written, the ideas are independent and well-considered, and the book as a whole is most refreshing.

Among Miller's striking ideas are his statement of the "realistic postulate" as "the mainspring of human sanity" (although his "realism" might equally well be idealistic or dualistic); the insight that it was the intention of the gospel "not to regiment but to free the forces incipient in the individual human soul by instituting a society based upon mutual affection"; and the startling judgment that the American revolution, by throwing off allegiance to England and creating a democratic state, became not only "the all-important event of modern history," but also "the most important happening in the political chronicle of all time."

Dr. Miller defines Christianity as a statement about God's appearing as man in the person of Jesus Christ, thus following Utrecht while querying the Christianity of St. James, Unitarians, and many liberals. Unfortunately he does not explain in any detail how he understands the incarnation; and, as he goes on, he lays more stress on the social kingdom of God than on his orthodox Christology.

The most surprising and unsatisfactory aspect of the book is its repudiation of the hope that philosophy may somehow unite science and religion and preserve

the truth of both. While correctly stating that "there is no logical clash" between science and religion, Miller overlooks the crying need for a correlation between scientific and religious world views. However, he really reinstates philosophy under the name of religion, which he calls "a study" that attempts to relate the evolution of life and society to their environment. Dr. Miller errs. Religion is a life, not a study. The "study" of the truth of religion is philosophy. Dr. Miller has fallen prey to the revolt against reason, "which," he avers, "was never more than a weak reed," and is "today an antique myth." Further reflection on the nature of reason and of philosophy is indicated!

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN

Man's Vision of God and the Logic of Theism, by Charles Hartshorne, Chicago, Willett, Clark, 1941, pp. xxi, 360, \$3.00.

This is the second volume in a trilogy on philosophical theology, of which *Beyond Humanism* was the first. In the first volume Professor Hartshorne defined his position in contrast with the non-theistic humanism of John Dewey, which used to prevail at the University of Chicago. In the present volume he relates it to the neo-Thomism of Mortimer Adler and Jacques Maritain, which President Hutchins is now trying to introduce at Chicago. Against humanism, Hartshorne maintains the legitimacy of a metaphysical approach to the knowledge of God. Against Thomism, and much of orthodox Protestant theology as well, he maintains that the metaphysical conception of God as *a Being in all respects perfect* is philosophically and religiously unsound.

As a pupil of "several of the most competent logicians that ever lived, including C. I. Lewis, H. M. Sheffer, A. N. Whitehead, Charles Peirce" (p. vii), Hartshorne modestly but perhaps a bit ironically suggests that what has been chiefly lacking in philosophical discussions of theism is "exactitude, logical rigor." A shrewd thrust at the Thomists, who have prided themselves on this very thing! In strict logic, he insists, the conception of a Perfect Being which Christian philosophy took over from Greek philosophy is only ambiguously compatible with the living and loving God of Christian faith. From this Greek concept of God, both the Christian concept of God *and its opposite*, can be and have been inferred; whereas the Greek concept can never be logically inferred from the Christian. If however we substitute for the idea of *a Being in all respects perfect* that of *a Being in some, indeed in most, respects perfect, but really involved in human suffering*, then these logical difficulties disappear.

Hartshorne points out that this is the conception to which unsophisticated religious faith has often come, in spite of the theologians; and the trend of modern Protestant theology has been in this same direction. If it were not for the authority of St. Thomas Aquinas, Catholic theology could immensely strengthen itself by substituting "most" for "all" in its doctrine of the divine perfections—a slight amendment of Aristotle compared with some that St. Thomas actually made.

The meaning of this "second-type theism" is worked out elaborately, with much religious insight as well as with great logical acuteness. It does not necessarily imply the notion of a "finite God," like William James's, but rather that of a "finite-infinite God," always implicit in the idea of the Incarnation, and recently defended by some philosophical theologians such as Montague and Brightman. Herein lies a logical challenge that Thomists cannot logically evade, as they could evade the challenge of James and Bergson by crying "anti-intellect-

tualism." It would be fascinating to listen in on a quadrangular discussion at the Chicago Quadrangle Club between Jacques Maritain, Hartshorne, Dewey, and H. N. Wieman, whose concept of God as the "growing good" lies between Hartshorne's "second-type theism" and Dewey's humanism. Out of such a discussion, much new light on the highest of all problems might suddenly dawn. Hartshorne has provided us with a powerful mental catalytic agent which may precipitate a really new situation in the theological and philosophical world.

WALTER MARSHALL HORTON

The Revelation of St. John, by Martin Kiddle (assisted by M. K. Ross), New York, Harper, 1941, pp. xlix, 460, \$3.50.

In this, the youngest member of the *Moffatt New Testament Commentary* family, we have a distinct and notable contribution which will almost certainly be hailed with delight. There are but a few ministers, even in this day of so-called enlightenment, who are not tormented by some crackpot in the congregation who has drunk deeply, but not wisely, of the heady wine of Revelation, and, as is often the case after potent draughts, wants to tell everybody about it. The book is in the New Testament—even worse, it stands at the close of sacred Scripture. It is authenticated by a solemn curse. Many a minister has thus found that he stood in a very awkward spot. If my experience is any criterion, the usual procedure when the spot becomes too hot is for the harassed parson to send an SOS to his seminary, asking for a book on Revelation which will enable him to escape his tormentor ere he slay him. Unfortunately there are few books in English (or, for that matter, in any other language) which are really satisfactory. There are numerous volumes—and good ones—which concern themselves with the several problems of background and literary analysis; very few that actually make intelligible and attractive to the non-expert this ancient enigma. And yet, as Dr. Kiddle rightly says, "Modern knowledge and the modern scientific approach to Bible study leave no excuse for any further repetition of such errors"—he had been speaking of the lush types of interpretation which have so often ruined this ancient masterpiece of faith.

Thus this present volume fills a real need. Its chief characteristic is sanity. The author knows all the problems (and most of the answers), but he steadfastly refuses to let himself become sidetracked as to who "John" was or what "666" might have meant. It is not a controversial volume; never does he attack or ridicule an opponent. He simply disregards the irrelevant, and sets forth what he thinks the message and value of this apocalypse are.

The particular arrangement of material which characterizes this series of commentaries—a short unit of the text in Moffatt's translation, followed by comments—is particularly fitted to Kiddle's work. The commentary is written throughout in an easy, fluid style, markedly different from the catena of scrappy comments which readers have come to associate with the word *commentary*. In addition to a really excellent introduction to the volume as a whole is a series of introductory essays to sections which require a longer and broader treatment than a mere running comment would provide.

The author is a parish minister. It would appear that his principal concern has been to make intelligible (and that really means to reveal the beauty and power!) of the ancient writing to the run-of-the-mill reader. Nevertheless the most expert apocalyptic detective may read it with distinct profit. Adam Clarke was once prompted to exclaim: "The more it [*sc.* Revelation] was studied, the less was

it understood, as generally either finding a man cracked or leaving him so." That homiletic pearl from yesteryear reminds me at least of the rhyme about Humpty Dumpty. It would be too much to expect that those already cracked can be put together again; if Dr. Kiddle's volume should serve to keep some safely sitting on the wall, many preachers will call him blessed.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

Worship, by J. O. Dobson, New York, Macmillan, 1941, pp. 190, \$1.25.

"Man must needs worship" is the author's opening sentence and the theme of his first chapter. That is to say, he begins with deep human need and a basic human urge. Man is the worshipping animal.

The volume reveals a contemporary worship movement in England—as well as in our own country—which is causing much thought among the leaders of both established and free churches. Chapter headings are very familiar to American readers: "The Necessity of Worship," "The Nature of Worship," "Christian Worship," "The Manner of Worship," "Art in Worship," "The Future of Worship," "The Sermon in Worship," and "The Fulfillment of Worship."

Essentially, "worship is man's response to God"; and the reader soon discovers that the personal, Christian God is meant—"the highest form of existence we can conceive, that is, perfect personality." Naturally, in the churches the emphasis is on "seeking God," but we are reminded that, "Those who have sounded the profounder depths of Christian experience have become aware that they were seeking God because he had first sought them."

Christian worship has a long and rich history; yet it follows much the same pattern, *i.e.*, man is always making an offering or paying a tribute, and in return is receiving God's grace, and dedicating himself to God's service. In the process he employs symbols, builds liturgies, creates and uses many of the arts.

Historically, services of worship divide into two parts, namely, that of the word and of the sacrament. Under the former comes the law, the Bible, the sermon, and other types of instruction, while the latter is variously denominated the supper, or eucharist, or holy communion, or mass.

In Chapter IV the author deals with the manner of worship advocated by the various Reformers. This constitutes one of the most instructive sections of his book; he begins with Luther and ends with the Wesleys and the Quakers.

The notable decline in church attendance in England is noted and several reasons are catalogued, notably secularization of life and economic security. Belief is expressed that the one hope is in genuine worship, the program of which strikes a happy balance between liturgy and sermon. Both of these must speak the language of our day, in so far as historic continuity permits.

The reviewer estimates this a concise, thorough, and wise presentation of the essentials of Christian worship. The author writes directly, and has a happy faculty of illuminating his thought by apt quotation, particularly from the poets.

W. R. McNUTT

Anno Domini, by Kenneth S. Latourette, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. xv, 248, \$2.50.

Professor Latourette has divided the Christian centuries into four great periods: the first five hundred years, 500 to 1500, 1500 to 1800, and 1800 to the present; and has used four criteria with which to measure the influence of Jesus in these periods, namely, 1. geographic extension, 2. new religious movements attributable to Jesus,

3. the effect of Jesus upon various phases of human culture, and 4. the extent to which individuals have been shaped by the inward religious experience which arises through Jesus. His conclusion is that "measured by his influence, Jesus is central in the human story. The chronology which reckons time by the categories Before Christ and Anno Domini is correct. Far from outmoding it, accumulating human experience only confirms the insight displayed in its adoption." While there has been an ebb as well as a flow in the tide of this influence in each period considered, Latourette contends that in each succeeding period the ebb has never gone back as far as in the preceding one, and that today, despite all that seems untoward, the influence of Jesus is more profound and widespread than ever before in history. He marshals a great deal of evidence to maintain his thesis; history is, no doubt, more convincing evidence than abstract reason. One feels that the case would be more convincing to those who do not accept the Christian position if there were a fuller and more specific acknowledgment of the negative side of the picture; if, for example, a book like Westermarck's *Christianity and Morals* were taken into account. Are not many of the books by Christian authors convincing primarily to those who are already convinced? This is not to suggest that Latourette is unaware of the negative side of the picture or that he fails to acknowledge it. It is rather to suggest that an historian of his proved competence might make a stronger case than he has if he faced the contrary interpretations specifically.

GORDON POTEAT

The Redentin Easter Play, translated from the Low German of the fifteenth century with introduction and notes by A. E. Zucker, New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, pp. x, 134, \$2.00.

The translator quite justifiably remarks in his Preface: "It has seemed worth while, therefore, to make it [the play] accessible to English readers, both for its literary merits and for its value as a medieval cultural document."

Without presuming to assess the philological merits of the work—a task beyond the reviewer's ability, and distinctly subordinate to the true worth of the volume—one can but recognize that not only as literature but as a social document the play surely deserves far wider consideration than its original tongue can afford.

In the first place it brings its readers close to a century of transition from romanticism to harsh realism, an era bitterly like our own, in which the hopes and ideals of progress into a golden age were frustrated as devotion to prayer and loyalty to the feudal overlord gave way to materialist skepticism and nationalist chauvinism; so, with us faith in science and in business are yielding place to—what new urge of the will to live?

The collapse of so glorious an era as the Middle Ages—the cosmos of Gothic art, Thomist philosophy, and poetic narrative of the highest order—this collapse is but superficially different from our own of today. The fifteenth century, so vividly felt in these pages, is a period that has lost its grip, cannot attempt, even, to control events, let alone aspire to raising the standard of life and aspiration. Its parallel to this twentieth century is all too obvious.

So this play may well cause its readers to look about them as with freshly opened eyes. And, further, it may suggest that our own peculiar form of dramatization, the moving picture, is now and again setting before us serious yet entertaining depiction of our own cultural and social status, employing familiar scenes and problems as symbols of the underlying mood of our age.

Faith and hope do not yield utterly to cynicism in this play, nor do they in the world we still regard as ours. And out of the greed and sadism of the Renaissance there arose, as we trust there will with us, a noble adjustment and reformulation of meanings and values.

J. C. SCAMMELL

Heresy and Inquisition in Narbonne, by Richard Wilder Emery, New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, pp. 184, \$2.50.

The factors that produced heresy in the medieval period, or were in any way related to its rise, have long stirred the research interest of historians. Suggestions covering the entire range of human affairs and conditions of life have been offered—religious, social, economic, political.

In certain cases heresy seems to have been a reaction to the corruption of the church or a revolt against ecclesiastical overlords. At times and in differing localities it was due to the broader social situations. Mingling of peoples with varying moral views and racial heritages, freedom and independence born of economic prosperity, protection by civil and political authorities have been offered as explanations of this divergence from the orthodoxy of the church.

Lack of uniformity on the part of the church in its treatment of heresy has also puzzled students. Records reveal that communities in the centre of heretical regions have on occasions wholly escaped the prosecution of the Inquisition.

As an aid in understanding this larger fact in the history of the church Dr. Emery has made a study of Narbonne, a rich merchant centre in Languedoc, France. In the thirteenth century this town, in which heresy certainly was rife, escaped prosecution though other towns not more than fifteen miles distant suffered the terrors of the Inquisition. The author's researches have proved to him that in this case the viscounts in their struggle for power against the archbishops secured the support of the people by protecting them from such prosecution. When in the fourteenth century political government became centralized in the king, as the ecclesiastical was in the archbishop, prosecution by the Inquisition became active, the royal authority sharing in the confiscations.

R. E. E. HARKNESS

Secretly Armed, by Allan A. Hunter, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. x, 159, \$1.50.

The author's evident purpose in writing the book is to deal a stout blow to militarism, and to offer a better way than the "war-method" to solve the difficult problems of human relationships, personal and international.

In laying out his campaign against Mars, he singles out fear as the first foe to be faced. He insists that there is a "mysterious principle" working in us which we should trust, and which will replace the desire for "safety first" with "creative expectation" as the motivating principle in our lives. After giving many striking instances of how this has worked in the promotion of friendliness and normality, he points to "paranoid nationalism" as the pressing evil which men of faith must overthrow today.

In his chapter on "Overcoming Organized Hatred" Dr. Hunter asserts that "War can be abolished only by utilizing for a higher purpose the powers which now sustain it." He believes that we can "confront gigantic units of oncoming tanks with spiritual force," and faces without flinching the possible consequences of such action.

The last three chapters of the book are devoted to the problem of arming the

individual soldier to do his part in this heroic undertaking. The familiar technique of the mystics is presented as opening the way to victory over softness, covetousness, pride, and fear. Their experience is recounted to show us where to begin to learn "to let go of self and to live henceforth in God." The final word of the author urges the importance of beginning at this moment "to point *your* life in the right direction." The volume is ably written and never lets the interest of the reader flag. Even the pages which may not carry conviction have a challenging and inspiring quality.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER

BOOK NOTICES

Your Child and God, by Robbie Trent, Chicago, Willett, Clark, 1941, pp. ix, 146, \$1.50.

Here is a book of wisdom. The author has three manifest qualifications: love of children, religious sanity, and thorough acquaintance with her field of interest. The jacket announces, "The author's own religious view is frankly conservative"; if so, we would better all go conservative. The author has religion; she believes in God the Father, in Jesus whom the Father is like, in the Bible as a source of inspiration and understanding, and in the religious capacity of the child.

"Shall I Teach my Child about God?" The answer is a positive affirmative. The suggestion of the "fundamental" approach is excellent—teach the child what God does: he sends sunshine and rain and food, he inspires kindness and love and honesty, he makes the beauty of flower and butterfly and song of bird, etc. But when Miss Trent comes to consider how to teach about Jesus, she forsakes her "functional" idea and substitutes the biological; hence Billie says, "But you know that Jesus was God's boy, don't you? Well, don't you s'pose he'd take after his father?" Billie's insight would not have been thus warped, had he been taught in accord with the functional pattern, *i.e.*, he was *son* because he functioned like God—and, moreover, Billie is God's boy when he thinks and acts like Jesus.

Chapter V is entitled, "The Best Book," namely the best book for religious knowledge, evaluation, and guidance—the Bible. Truly it is a repository of great religious insight and high inspiration, and our author employs it as such most commendably. Even so, she is tempted in the direction of Bible worship when she calls it "God's Book." Surely he neither wrote it nor dictated it; in truth, it is Man's Book in which he has recorded, among other things, his deepest religious understandings and his noblest religious aspirations. Certainly the little child deserves to be spared the mischievous "Word of God" idea.

Aside from these two unguarded attitudes—toward Jesus and the Bible—Miss Trent has done an exceptional piece of work. The reviewer commends it therefore almost above any similar book of which he knows. It is beautifully written, aptly illustrated from the school and nursery, and is altogether worthy of becoming a handbook for the guidance of Christian mothers of young children.

W. R. McNUTT

Pastoral Psychology, by Karl Ruf Stolz, New York, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1941, pp. 284, \$2.50.

This is an enlarged and revised edition of *Pastoral Psychology* of 1932. It is revised in the light of much new knowledge in the field, and is therefore more complete. The author covers, with rare skill, the whole area of what the good pastor ought to know about the contribution which psychology has to make to his richer ministry to people. This is the kind of book one wishes were in the hands of every minister wise enough to practice its wisdom in his parish work.

From first to last Dr. Stolz has kept close to the practical task of the good minister whose ideal is a person-centred service to all sorts and conditions of people. Every page is laden with "cases" and other practical helps.

This volume is another witness and testimony to the fact that the pastoral ministry is rapidly becoming a more understanding, even a more scientific, ministry.

It is not sufficient that the minister be a good friend, he must also be a wise and understanding friend, else he may do more harm than good. If and when he becomes this sort of friend, his pastoral ministry will increase in health-giving and therapeutic value. This book is capable of becoming a handbook for such a ministry.

Of the eighteen chapters the reviewer wishes to indicate a few of the greater significance: I "The Psychological Approach to Pastoral Work"; V "Personality Types and Religious Experience"; VIII "Religion as a Rallying Center"; XV "Religion and the Talk Cure"; XVII "The Technique of Private Prayer and Worship"; and XVIII "Pastoral Counseling." These are indicative of the wide scope covered by the volume and at the same time reveal a religion-centred interest.

We are inclined to agree with the Religious Book Club Bulletin in its estimate, "The most practical and direct handbook for the pastor we have ever seen."

W. R. McNUTT

A Testament of Devotion, by Thomas R. Kelley (with a Biographical Memoir by Douglas V. Steere), New York, Harper, 1941, pp. 124, \$1.00.

Douglas Steere's Biographical Memoir is a valuable introduction to the writings of Thomas Kelley. Kelley is revealed as a man in whom two great forces struggled for possession. Their synthesis is itself an important value of the book. He began as a slave of his own mind, dedicated to a search for that which was scientifically true. Yet there were also the demands of his heart, the imperatives of religion. "In his [Rufus Jones'] classroom he sensed the lure of philosophy and of a search for truth in which his religious hunger and his passion for science might both be given their due" (p. 2).

His early years were a rebellion against evangelical religion, but later, as his experience ripened, he discovered "a devotion that far exceeds the mere possession of inward states of exaltation" (p. 24). He wanted the life of a scholar and the joy of research, but found active and practical living a challenge. Aided by his great love of people and a chastening sense of humor he achieved a balance and a perspective that give impressiveness and authority to his writings.

We are indebted to Steere for editing these five papers, but our greater indebtedness to him is for giving us the life behind them. We know the kind of man who searched for and found an adequate life—one "which has grasped intuitively the whole nature of things" and by that discovery gives others a conviction that what he says is authentic, the result of acquaintance with, rather than a knowledge of, truth.

The papers themselves are essentially witnesses to "The Light Within" that eventuates in "Holy Obedience" and the formation of "The Blessed Community" (to use three of their titles). They are pleas for a commitment to the practice of the presence of God—devotional exercises in some respects. Two qualities make them particularly timely: their emphasis upon the relation of the Eternal and the Now; their insistence that the true simplification of life takes adequate account of its complexity. Perhaps these are but one problem, the making of our religious living into a practical life.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

The World-View of Jesus, by Elmer W. K. Mould, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. ix, 238, \$2.00.

Jesus is here presented as a genuinely creative thinker who, although employing the thought-patterns of his age, left behind him a philosophy valid for any age. Dr. Mould has read widely and has tabulated much. One thinks of the Jewish ideal—a well-plastered cistern which should not lose a drop poured into it. Thus the volume is replete with quotations, not alone from the Old Testament and kindred writings, but from modern writers, introduced by the very terse (and somewhat tiresome) "So-and-so states" or "Professor This-and-that well says." The 828 notes are collected on sixteen pages at the end of the book and are set in a format which renders them completely unusable. How long will authors and publishers continue to perform this particularly exasperating inanity for the sake of pages without footnotes?

MORTON S. ENSLIN

The Church of Our Fathers, by Roland H. Bainton, New York, Scribner, 1941, pp. 248, \$2.50.

Professor Bainton has assayed in this one volume a story of the Christian church for children. In language appropriate for the purpose the high lights of the history gleam brightly, focusing the attention of the young readers. Even obtuse doctrinal systems and their bitter controversies become clear—or at least clearer—as the involved and complicated gyrations of the scholastic and philosophical phraseology is brushed aside. This achievement is possible only, of course, by a remarkable understanding on the part of the author of the historical facts. Interest is captured and intensified by the aid of pictures and illustrations taken from originals found in early tracts and books of later reproductions. Though written for the young, the book can be read with profit by their elders. Its quotations from rare sources, its happy wit, and above all its spirit of sympathetic appreciation and loyalty to the stream of Christian faith commend it to all.

R. E. E. HARKNESS

The Code of Christ, by Gerald Heard, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. xxi, 168, \$1.50.

Mr. Heard's exposition of the Beatitudes is unique, but not absurd nor erratic. He does not write as an expert in literary criticism, and this leads one to take exception to some of his statements. He approaches his interpretation from the background of his studies in mysticism, Christian and oriental, and his knowledge of modern science. His illustrative comments are drawn largely from these two fields. The Beatitudes are interpreted as the Ladder of Perfection in a manner analogous to the Buddhist Ladder with which he makes frequent comparisons. This book is more difficult to read than his previous *Creed of Christ*, but it contains thoughts and suggestions worth pondering. The fundamental purpose is religious and practical in the highest sense. The Beatitudes are accepted as the path to the true happiness of holiness (wholeness, the highway of the evolution of consciousness). The author's major concern is that men of today may find the way which is so darkly obscured by the events of our time. One quotation will exemplify his point of view:

The only way to achieve an order in Time is not through concentrating on imposing a temporal physical Utopia. You will only have to go on liquidating increasing numbers of men because they are not fit, or will not fit into one's plans. We have to have a fulcrum outside Time ultimately if we are ever really to affect the things of Time—otherwise the revolutions

simply revolve like a child trying to cross a creek in a barrel and "the more we change things the more they are the same." We must be transcendental if we are ever to be in fact practical (p. 140).

GORDON POTEAT

The Kingdom of God and the American Dream, by Sherwood Eddy, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. xii, 319, \$2.90.

This is essentially a reader's digest of American history written to demonstrate the significant part religion has played in the development of the United States. Since the religious factor has been omitted or underemphasized by several important American historians in recent years, it is well to have someone remedy this oversight. Dr. Eddy, however, does not make the mistake of going to the other extreme of overemphasizing the importance of the influence of religion. He sees three dominant strains in our development—the religious hope of the kingdom of God on earth which derived from the Reformation, the secular dream of democracy which derived from the eighteenth century Enlightenment, and the sordid lust of materialism which is the product of unregenerate human nature. The presence of these strains in national life is illustrated throughout the book by short biographical sketches of persons who manifest these influences, for example, Roger Williams, Benjamin Franklin, Henry Ford. The failures as well as the triumphs of religion are faithfully indicated, and the last chapter, "The Twentieth Century," which brings the story down to the present war, is an appeal that "we should put our own house in order" since it is "in the realm of the spirit where we are weakest." Perhaps the chief value of this book is in its bringing together under one cover testimony to the indubitable importance of the Christian religion for the health of the state. Ministers who are largely responsible for insisting upon this fact will find it a very useful mine of material.

GORDON POTEAT

Know the Truth, by Joseph A. Cottam, New York, American Tract Society, 1940, pp. 259, \$1.50.

Dr. Cottam is a Philadelphia minister serving a community church; to this work he comes after many years as a frontier missionary, Chautauqua manager and lecturer, and lecturer to high schools and colleges on religious themes. *Know the Truth* reveals a generous, logical, richly stored mind. The volume states the theological case for the religious conservative, states it with honest, irenic temper. Dr. Cottam clearly reveals that his primary interest is in the quality of life which doctrine begets rather than in doctrine for its own sake, and moreover he shows repeated flashes of spiritual insight which break through the thick bark of a wooden theology. Surely if one could accept his major premise that the Bible (as he interprets it, of course) is the very word of God, then he would find himself in full agreement to the end. Even so, the liberal must come away from the reading of such a book with increased respect for the conservative position, though compelled to reject not a few of its unproved and improbable assumptions.

W. R. McNUTT

BOOKS RECEIVED

A Quest for God, by R. C. Campbell, Nashville, Broadman, 1941, pp. 153, \$1.00.

The Living Christ in the Life of Today, by M. E. Dodd and others, Nashville, Broadman, 1941, pp. 128, \$1.00.

Kept by the Power of God, by J. W. Phillips, Nashville, Broadman, 1941, pp. 148, \$1.00.

Three volumes of sermons.

**Christianity in a Changing World*, by Shirley Jackson Case, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. viii, 204, \$2.00.

**Spinoza and Religion*, by Elmer Ellsworth Powell, Boston, Chapman and Grimes, 1941, pp. xv, 344, \$2.50.

**Paul Becomes a Literary Influence*, by Albert E. Barnett, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1941, pp. xiii, 277, \$2.50.

**The Psychology of Christian Personality*, by Ernest M. Ligon, New York, Macmillan, 1940, pp. x, 393, \$3.00.

**Man of God*, by David E. Adams, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. 210, \$2.00.

**An Introduction to the History of Early New England Methodism*, by George Claude Baker, Jr., Durham, Duke University Press, 1941, pp. vii, 145, \$2.50.

The Art of Courtly Love, by Andreas Capellanus, with introduction, translation, and notes by John J. Parry, New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, pp. xi, 218, \$2.75.

This *Treatise on Love*, by Andreas the Chaplain, a not too sincere cleric who claimed to be chaplain of the royal court of Troyes, throws an interesting light on life in mediæval Europe. His theory, a heritage from Ovid—and shared by many moderns who never heard of either Ovid or Andreas—that a triangle is as necessary in life as it is in geometry, since love between a man and his own wife is utterly impossible, was set down in black and white at the order of Countess Marie of fragrant memory as a sort of *Blackstone* for use in her court of love. The book is worth reading and will probably disappoint only the prurient—and those without a sense of humor.

**New Gateways to Creative Living*, by Hornell Hart, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1941, pp. 197, \$1.75.

* To be reviewed.

ANNUAL INDEX

I

ARTICLES

By Title

- Bellerophon Swats the Gadfly (*Matthias R. Heilig*), 198
 Bible Today: A Jewish Viewpoint, The (*David Baumgardt*), 219
 Call of the Prophet Amos, The (*Rolland E. Wolfe*), 323
 Essence of Christianity, The (*Edgar S. Brightman*), 111
 Ethnologist Speaks for the Pagan Indians, An (*Frank G. Speck*), 213
 Footnote to the Gospel Record, A (*C. Walton Marteney*), 233
 Freedom in Catholic Theological Thought (*William J. McGarry, S. J.*), 23
 Fresh View of the Introduction to Paul's Letters, A (*Donald W. Riddle*), 306
 Is Roman Catholicism Winning? (*Conrad H. Moehlman*), 157
 Keach—Whitefield—Rippon: A Bypath in Early Hymnody (*W. T. Whitley*), 315
 Light from the Greek Text on the Date of Galatians (*H. E. Dana*), 160
 Metrical Structure of II Kings 19:20-28, The (*Theophile J. Meek*), 126
 Notes on the Problem of Suffering (*J. S. Bixler*), 288
 Old Testament Prophet in His Background, The (*I. G. Matthews*), 3
 One Holy Church (*Edwin L. Clarke*), 301
 Popular Religion of Greece and its Survivals, The (*Walter W. Hyde*), 132
 Preaching and the Worship Service (*Robert E. Keighton*), 225
 Preaching Christ in War Time (*William P. Merrill*), 189
 Professor Brightman's "Christian Essentials" (*M. C. Otto*), 329
 Responsibility of the Seminary, The (*W. Everett Henry*), 236
 Self-Pity in the Psalms (*Ovid R. Sellers*), 297
 Some Facts about Palestine (*George R. Berry*), 38
 Some Fruits of Silence (*William W. Comfort*), 281
 Speaking of Challenges (*Henry C. Newell*), 32
 Theology in the Light of Psychiatric Experience (*Anton T. Boisen*), 47
 Thus Speak the Deans and Presidents: A Symposium, 89
 To End the Universal Christian Schism (*Conrad H. Moehlman*), 14

- Book Notices: 78, 181, 272, 348. *See Index II*
 Books Received: 83, 187, 279, 352
 Book Reviews: 65, 166, 246, 339. *See Index II*
 From Off the Campus and On: 62, 164, 244, 337

By Authors

- Barstow, R. W. (*Thus Speak the Deans and Presidents*), 101
 Baumgardt, David (*The Bible Today: A Jewish Viewpoint*), 219
 Beaven, A. W. (*Thus Speak the Deans and Presidents*), 94
 Berry, George R. (*Some Facts about Palestine*), 38
 Bixler, J. S. (*Notes on the Problem of Suffering*), 288
 (*Thus Speak the Deans and Presidents*), 103
 Boisen, Anton T. (*Theology in the Light of Psychiatric Experience*), 47
 Brightman, Edgar S. (*The Essence of Christianity*), 111
 Clarke, Edwin L. (*One Holy Church*), 301
 Colwell, Ernest C. (*Thus Speak the Deans and Presidents*), 108
 Comfort, William W. (*Some Fruits of Silence*), 281

- Dana, H. E. (*Light from the Greek Text on the Date of Galatians*), 160
 Davidson, Richard (*Thus Speak the Deans and Presidents*), 98
 Dun, Angus (*Thus Speak the Deans and Presidents*), 99
 Fosbroke, Hughell (*Thus Speak the Deans and Presidents*), 100
 Franklin, James H. (*Thus Speak the Deans and Presidents*), 95
 Heilig, Matthias R. (*Bellerophon Swats the Gadfly*), 198
 Henry, W. Everett (*The Responsibility of the Seminary*), 236
 Herrick, E. C. (*Thus Speak the Deans and Presidents*), 89
 Hyde, Walter W. (*The Popular Religion of Greece and its Survivals*), 132
 Keighton, Robert E. (*Preaching and the Worship Service*), 225
 King, G. B. (*Thus Speak the Deans and Presidents*), 106
 Ladd, W. P. (*Thus Speak the Deans and Presidents*), 90
 Mackay, John A. (*Thus Speak the Deans and Presidents*), 105
 Marteney, C. Walton (*A Footnote to the Gospel Record*), 233
 Matthews, I. G. (*The Old Testament Prophet in His Background*), 3
 McGarry, William J., S. J. (*Freedom in Catholic Theological Thought*), 23
 McGiffert, A. C., Jr. (*Thus Speak the Deans and Presidents*), 104
 Meek, Theophile J. (*The Metrical Structure of II Kings 19: 20-28*), 126
 Merrill, William P. (*Preaching Christ in War Time*), 189
 Moehlman, Conrad H. (*Is Roman Catholicism Winning?*), 157
 (*To End the Universal Christian Schism*), 14
 Newell, Henry C. (*Speaking of Challenges*), 32
 Otto, M. C. (*Professor Brightman's "Christian Essentials"*), 329
 Palmer, Albert W. (*Thus Speak the Deans and Presidents*), 92
 Riddle, Donald W. (*A Fresh View of the Introduction to Paul's Letters*), 306
 Russell, Elbert (*Thus Speak the Deans and Presidents*), 97
 Sellers, Ovid R. (*Self-Pity in the Psalms*), 297
 Speck, Frank G. (*An Ethnologist Speaks for the Pagan Indians*), 213
 Weigle, Luther A. (*Thus Speak the Deans and Presidents*), 109
 Whitley, W. T. (*Keach—Whitefield—Rippon: A Bypath in Early Hymnody*), 315
 Wolfe, Rolland E. (*The Call of the Prophet Amos*), 323

II

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

The reviews are arranged alphabetically (disregarding *A* and *The*) by titles. The names of the reviewers (in parentheses) follow the authors.

- Adversity's Noblemen*, C. E. Trinkaus (G. W. DAVIS), 79
Agrarian Conflicts in Colonial New York: 1711-1775, Irving Mark (A. R. MOORE), 185
An American Commentary on the Old Testament: Ezekiel, I. G. Matthews (W. C. GRAHAM), 65
American Mirror, H. E. Luccock (W. R. MC NUTT), 70
Anno Domini, K. S. Latourette (GORDON POTEAT), 344
At Jesus' Feet, Edward W. Schramm, ed. (W. R. MC NUTT), 81
The Baptist Romance in the Heart of Europe, Joseph Novotny (C. H. SEARS), 76
Benedictine Monasticism, Sister M. A. Schroll (I. G. MATTHEWS), 274
Biography of the Gods, A. E. Haydon (G. W. DAVIS), 260
The Book of English Collects, J. W. Suter, Jr. (R. E. KEIGHTON), 186
Can Christianity Save Civilization? W. M. Horton (GORDON POTEAT), 174
Can Religious Education Be Christian? H. S. Elliott (W. R. MC NUTT), 73
Can We Keep the Faith? J. B. Pratt (J. S. BIXLER), 340
Chart for Happiness, Hornell Hart (GORDON POTEAT), 183
The Christian Attitude toward War, Loraine Boettner (RITTENHOUSE NEISSER), 185
Christian Ethics in History and Modern Life, A. G. Widgey (GORDON POTEAT), 79

- Christian Faith in History*, Hugh Miller (E. S. BRIGHTMAN), 341
The Christian Fellowship, Nels F. S. Ferré (J. L. FOREMAN), 181
Christianity: An Inquiry into Its Nature and Truth, H. R. Rall (G. W. DAVIS), 250
Christianity and Power Politics, Reinhold Niebuhr (GORDON POTEAT), 74
The Church and a Christian Society, W. C. Barclay (W. R. MC NUTT), 182
The Church of Our Fathers, R. H. Bainton (R. E. E. HARKNESS), 350
The Code of Christ, Gerald Heard (GORDON POTEAT), 350
Come, Let Us Worship, A. W. Palmer (W. R. MC NUTT), 278
Commonwealth or Anarchy? J. A. R. Marriott (D. H. BINING), 176
The Creed of Christ, Gerald Heard (GORDON POTEAT), 184
The Development of Religious Toleration in England, W. K. Jordan (J. W. BRUSH), 166
An Enlightened Conscience, I. G. Whitchurch (W. K. WRIGHT), 256
The Ephesian Tradition, H. E. Dana (M. S. ENSLIN), 169
Essays on Maimonides, S. W. Baron, ed. (M. S. ENSLIN), 275
An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament, W. D. Chamberlain (M. S. ENSLIN), 172
A Faith to Affirm, J. G. Gilkey (W. R. MC NUTT), 80
Form and Freedom in Worship, Clarence Seidenspinner (W. R. MC NUTT), 272
The Four Pillars of Democracy, E. J. Goodspeed (I. G. MATTHEWS), 184
French Pioneers in the West Indies, 1624-1664, N. M. Crouse (A. R. MOORE), 184
From the Stone Age to Christianity, W. F. Albright (I. G. MATTHEWS), 246
Glimpses of Mennonite History, J. C. Wenger (A. R. MOORE), 185
The Good Shepherd, C. F. Andrews (W. R. MC NUTT), 277
The Gospel of the Kingdom, F. C. Grant (M. S. ENSLIN), 67
The Great Century, K. S. Latourette (S. E. MEAD and W. W. SWEET), 265
Greek Popular Religion, M. P. Nilsson (M. S. ENSLIN), 68
Harper's Topical Concordance, C. R. Joy (RITTENHOUSE NEISSER), 78
Heresy and Inquisition in Narbonne, R. W. Emery (R. E. E. HARKNESS), 346
History of the Norwegian Baptists in America, Peder Stiansen (RITTENHOUSE NEISSER), 179
Honest Religion, John Oman (RITTENHOUSE NEISSER), 258
How Firm a Foundation, J. C. Muir (RITTENHOUSE NEISSER), 186
How to Find Health through Prayer, Glenn Clark (W. R. MC NUTT), 276
The Individual and His Society, Abram Kardiner (GORDON POTEAT), 79
An Introduction to Philo Judæus, E. R. Goodenough (M. S. ENSLIN), 266
Is God Emeritus? Shailer Mathews (GORDON POTEAT), 79
Italy and the Vatican at War, S. W. Halperin (R. H. ABRAMS), 72
Jesus Christ the Same, James Moffatt (GORDON POTEAT), 269
Just Among Friends, W. W. Comfort (J. H. FRANKLIN), 257
The Kantian Philosophy of Space, C. B. Garnett, Jr. (G. W. DAVIS), 178
The Kingdom of God and the American Dream, Sherwood Eddy (GORDON POTEAT), 351
The King James Version of the English Bible, David Daiches (I. G. MATTHEWS), 183
Know the Truth, J. A. Cottam (W. R. MC NUTT), 351
Law and Love, T. E. Jessop (GORDON POTEAT), 75
The Letters of Saint Boniface, Ephraim Emerton, tr. (G. W. DAVIS), 78
Let the Church Be the Church, E. G. Homrighausen (J. H. FRANKLIN), 170
Liberal Education in a Democracy, S. G. Cole (W. R. MC NUTT), 170
The Man Christ Jesus, John Knox (M. S. ENSLIN), 259
Manifest Victory, J. R. Moseley (RITTENHOUSE NEISSER), 272
Man's Vision of God and the Logic of Theism, Charles Hartshorne (W. M. HORTON), 342
The March of Medicine, New York Academy of Medicine, ed. (R. E. KEIGHTON), 82
The Meaning of Revelation, H. R. Niebuhr (G. W. DAVIS), 262
The Messianic Hope of Israel, M. I. Reich (I. G. MATTHEWS), 81
Modern Dictatorship, Diana Spearman (R. H. ABRAMS), 71

- Moral Leaders*, E. H. Griggs (G. W. DAVIS), 75
The Nature and Destiny of Man, Reinhold Niebuhr (G. W. DAVIS), 261
New Poets from Old, H. W. Wells (R. E. KEIGHTON), 76
The New Testament in Basic English, S. H. Hooke and others (M. S. ENSLIN), 339
Not Alone, J. R. Sizoo (W. R. MC NUTT), 80
The Origins of the Bible, T. J. Soares (I. G. MATTHEWS), 274
The Other Side of the Jordan, Nelson Glueck (I. G. MATTHEWS), 66
Pastoral Psychology, K. R. Stolz (W. R. MC NUTT), 348
The Place of Nationalism in Religion, J. W. C. Ward (J. H. FRANKLIN), 182
The Philosophy of Schleiermacher, R. B. Brandt (N. F. S. FERRÉ), 264
A Philosophy of the Christian Revelation, Edwin Lewis (G. W. DAVIS), 267
A Preface to Christian Theology, J. A. Mackay (G. W. DAVIS), 173
The Problem of Religious Knowledge, D. C. Macintosh (G. W. DAVIS), 253
The Prophets and Their Times, J. M. P. Smith and W. A. Irwin (I. G. MATTHEWS), 252
Protestantism's Hour of Decision, J. W. Nixon (GORDON POTEAT), 181
Quaker Education in Theory and Practice, H. H. Brinton (RITTENHOUSE NEISSER), 177
Reaching the Unchurched, A. L. Murray (W. R. MC NUTT), 181
The Redentin Easter Play, A. E. Zucker (J. C. SCAMMELL), 345
Religion and the Modern World, University of Pennsylvania Bicentennial Conference (J. S. BIXLER), 255
Religion or Superstition—Which? R. J. Cole (I. G. MATTHEWS), 81
The Revelation of St. John, Martin Kiddle (M. S. ENSLIN), 343
The Reverend Colonel Finch, Elizabeth Nitchie (R. E. KEIGHTON), 77
Scholasticism and Politics, Jacques Maritain (G. W. DAVIS), 177
Science, Philosophy, and Religion, Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion (I. G. MATTHEWS), 273
Secretly Armed, A. A. Hunter (RITTENHOUSE NEISSER), 346
The Sermon on the Mount, Martin Dibelius (M. S. ENSLIN), 270
A Short History of Christianity, A. G. Baker, ed. (RITTENHOUSE NEISSER), 78
The Social Gospel Re-examined, F. E. Johnson (GORDON POTEAT), 74
The Springs of Creative Living, Rollo May (S. G. COLE), 167
A Testament of Devotion, T. R. Kelley (R. E. KEIGHTON), 349
Theory and Practice of Social Case Work, Gordon Hamilton (W. R. MC NUTT), 80
These Shared His Cross, E. M. Poteat (W. R. MC NUTT), 171
This Is the Victory, L. D. Weatherhead (J. H. FRANKLIN), 276
Three Centuries of American Hymnody, H. W. Foote (W. R. MC NUTT), 69
Tom Taylor and the Victorian Drama, Winton Tolles (R. E. KEIGHTON), 82
The Two Humanities, D. R. Davies (GORDON POTEAT), 180
War Propaganda and the United States, Harold Lavine and James Wechsler (F. B. IGLER), 171
'Way Away Tales, E. N. Harris, ed. (M. S. ENSLIN), 182
What We Mean by Religion, W. L. Sperry (J. H. FRANKLIN), 166
Woman in the Sacred Scriptures of Hinduism, M. W. Pinkham (G. W. DAVIS), 277
The World's Need of Christ, C. A. Ellwood (R. E. KEIGHTON), 175
The World-View of Jesus, E. W. K. Mould (M. S. ENSLIN), 350
Worship, J. O. Dobson (W. R. MC NUTT), 344
You Can Be Happily Married, Gilbert Appelhof, Jr. (W. R. MC NUTT), 275
Your Child and God, Robbie Trent (W. R. MC NUTT), 348